THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. III DECEMBER, 1921 No. 18

EDITORIAL

The Irish negotiations and the Washington Conference are characteristic of a world which has begun to convert its need for Peace from an aspiration into a purpose. In that atmosphere differences of long standing are apt to appear in a new light, and men seek for synthesis rather than for victory. We note this tendency in two spheres particularly which fall within the purview of this journal.

The first is the sphere of Doctrine. There are many indications of a growing conviction that the present divergences of doctrinal teaching amongst us should be, and can be, remedied. Thus, the Sixth Conference of Evangelical Churchmen held at Cheltenham in September claimed that no true unity could exist where contradictions in matters of doctrine remained unreconciled, and urged the duty of examining the standpoints of other schools of thought within the Church, with a view to effective agreement. Again, the General Synod of the Church in Canada included in the agenda of its recent meeting a motion asking for the convening of "a round-table conference between representatives of the two great schools of thought in the Church." While yet again a conference of clergy lately held at Lichfield showed that, so far as concerned England at least, it was not two schools of thought, but three, which would be concerned if the ground were to be fully covered.

The second sphere is that of Education; and we would strongly urge our readers to study the *Education Act*, 1921, *Amendment Bill* introduced last month into the House of Commons, embodying Mr. Fisher's proposals of March, 1920. It is never easy to surrender rights; but in this case the rights we hold are held for the good of others; and it is the children of the Church as a whole—in the provided no less than in the voluntary schools—whom we must think of. The present measure should undoubtedly result in giving religion a higher, because a more specialized, place in the minds both of teacher and taught; and for that reason we ask for it a very favourable consideration.

THE IDEA OF THE EUCHARIST

I.

I knew how beauty seen from unseen must rise,
How the body's joy for more than body's use was made.
I knew then how the body is the body of the mind.

GIORDANO BRUNO, the ex-Dominican, who was burnt by the Inquisition in 1600, said that "the physical universe occupies infinity." This doctrine seems very important for science and philosophy, although Einstein has thrown some doubt on the truth of it, but it is not easy to understand. Does it refer to infinity in space, or in time, or to anything more than that? And what is meant by "occupying" infinity? Does it mean that the physical universe is all that is? If so, then it seems either untrue or meaningless; for thoughts, and hopes, and desires, and resolutions, and emotions, and dreams undoubtedly exist, in some sense of the word "exist," and if the word "physical" is used to include both a dream and a pork-pie, then the word has no meaning at all. The "physical universe" is the whole sum of the things whose existence is perceptible by the senses; not thoughts, or spirits, or minds, but matter and energy and their manifestations. For more than a century and a half, since Bishop Berkeley wrote in England and Immanuel Kant in Germany, it has not been necessary to prove that something exists in addition to the things that we can taste and touch, and see, and hear, and smell. The onus of proof is on the other side; the materialist must prove that the physical universe has any existence at all, apart from the minds which perceive it. The important question, as a matter of fact, is not, what does the physical universe "occupy," but what *is* the physical universe? And most important is the question, what does the physical universe *mean?* That is the one question about the physical universe which is of interest for religion. The Christian view is rooted in the conviction that the material world exists to be God's means of expressing His mind and heart and will (to speak after the manner of men) to His children, and to be the means in and through which man grows into ever more perfect fellowship with, and likeness to, His Father. "The Laws of Nature are the thoughts of God."

Lord Morley, in the first volume of his *Recollections*, says that the last half of Book IV. of Wordsworth's "Excursion" is "among the finest things in great poetry. It is real religion."

There Wordsworth, with the poet's insight (which is not a special faculty that plain men do not possess, but is the insight of a man when he is most nobly and freely human, the insight of each one of us when he stands at the great experiences of life), shows what the world is, and is intended to be.

> I have seen
> A curious child, who dwelt upon a tract
> Of inland ground, applying to his ear
> The convolutions of a smooth-lipped shell;
> To which, in silence hushed, his very soul
> Listened intensely; and his countenance soon
> Brightened with joy; for from within were heard
> Murmurings, whereby the monitor expressed
> Mysterious union with its native sea.
> Even such a shell the universe itself
> Is to the ear of Faith; and there are times,
> I doubt not, when to you it doth impart
> Authentic tidings of invisible things;
> Of ebb and flow, and ever-during power;
> And central peace, subsisting at the heart
> Of endless agitation. Here you stand,
> Adore, and worship, when you know it not;
> Pious beyond the intention of your thought;
> Devout above the meaning of your will.

Any study of Nature carried on in final separation from some such view as this, any selfish probing of her mysteries merely in order that man may have power over her, or curious dissection of her dead body as though that were all, reveals its fundamental untruth by the fact that it degrades man instead of making him better, "waging an impious warfare with the very life of our own souls." The naturalism which banishes the thought of God and the soul when it attempts to understand the world (assuming that the spiritual element in things is what man puts into them, as though the material manifestation were not due to spiritual reality*) inevitably comes to think in terms of force, without any reference to the spirit, and (though perhaps unintentionally) without reference to conscience. That is the intellectual method which has laid Europe in ruins, and has secured that all the resources of modern science should be used to perfect engines of destruction, so that the large howitzer and the high-explosive shell are the characteristic products of modern civilization. That is the meaning of Rabelais' saying that science without conscience is damnation. Earth without God is a degrading and unsatisfying deception.

The physical universe is permanently an inspiration and comfort and discipline to a man only when, quite definitely, it is the means of his fellowship with God. The vague sentimental nature-worship of the spring poet gives a delusion of nature's sympathy, while men are willing to be deluded. It is only when they experience the natural world as the means by which the

* Alice Gardner, *History of Sacrament in Relation to Thought and Progress*, p. 173.

Father of spirits reveals Himself, that men find real courage and strength in contact with nature. Francis Thompson has put into moving words the truth that the physical universe is a sacrament. "The Supreme Spirit, creating, reveals His conceptions to man in the material forms of Nature. . . . An ideal wakes in the Omnipotent Painter; and straightway over the eternal dikes rush forth the flooding tides of night, the blue of Heaven ripples with stars; Nature, from alp to alpine flower, rises lovely with the betrayal of the Divine thought. An ideal wakes in the Omnipotent Poet; and there chimes the rhythm of an ordered universe. An ideal wakes in the Omnipotent Musician; and Creation vibrates with the harmony, from the palpitating throat of the bird to the surges of His thunder as they burst in fire along the roaring strands of Heaven. . . . Earthly beauty is but heavenly beauty taking to itself flesh."* "Our earthly city is the body of the city of God." The fact that these are the words of a poet, and that he mentions only the pleasant things in the physical universe, does not mean that the sacramentalism of nature is only an idle fancy. The loss and pain and waste in the world, and the possibility of sin and moral ruin, are tolerable on the assumption that they are the expression of God's creative will that men should, in the use of and conflict with these things, win the freedom and perfect personality in which alone they can enjoy equal fellowship with God. Law and destiny and nature exist to reveal God to man, and to discipline man, by that revelation, to become a person like God. "He that overcometh," says the Risen Christ, "I will give to him to sit down with Me in My throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with My Father in His throne" (Rev. iii. 21).

The physical universe is rightly understood, and possessed, and used, only when it is found in God and God in it. Even the gloom and darkness are the "shade of His hand, outstretched caressingly." But this must not be taken to mean that it is only in the whole, the all, the immensity of the infinite physical universe that God is revealed without misrepresentation. The experience of life, and one of the central thoughts of Christianity, is that the true meaning and highest value of the world is revealed not in the whole, but in particular things; not in crowds or mobs, but in definite persons; not in generalities, but in particulars. It has been said that "the individual is the true universal." It is certainly true that the God who reveals himself in humanity, revealed Himself especially and adequately in one human life. Jesus Christ was the light which lighteth every man coming into the world.

* "Nature's Immortality": *The Works of Francis Thompson*, vol. iii., pp. 86, 87.

It is remarkable that our Lord, who founded a world religion, never left His own land, and once stated, quite without reservation, that He was not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The key to the apparent contradiction is the story of the Good Samaritan. He had been asked, "Who is my neighbour?" He did not say, as a modern philanthropist might, "Everybody." He said, "The man whom you come across on your journey, who needs your help." We can only do our duty to humanity by doing it to the particular men and women who are part of our own lives. So He loved those whom He knew, and preached to His own people. There is a persistent weakness of heart and head which talks about the Brotherhood of Man and is ill-tempered and selfish in the family circle. But it is of the *greatness* of true love that it is individual; that it gives itself, for ever, to one person; as it is of the nobility of patriotism that it can count all the world well lost for the sacred earth of one small land. The suggested communization of women and children is not really a more spiritual conception than that of the Holy Family. Apart from particulars, the general is a mere word. Men can only find the all in the some.

There are broad-minded people who seek, above and behind Buddhism and Islam and Christianity, the eternal and absolute truth of which each positive religion is a poetic and popular presentation. Is it not probable, they argue, that the infinite and eternal God will manifest Himself to, and through, the soul of every people, so that each from its own standpoint can mirror one aspect of the Infinite, and all together reveal Him as He is? That is what might be expected, and, indeed, the idea is not without truth and value. But as a matter of plain historic fact it is to one nation, the Hebrews, that the human race is indebted for its faith far more than to all the others together. When God revealed Himself to humanity, that man might win at last assurance of the Divine in the human and of the Divine through the human, then, as Mr. Chesterton has put it, He spoke to all men of every race through chosen individuals of a chosen race.

In the same way, the sacramental meaning of the whole of nature and life is consummated and brought to full and explicit expression, and not denied or minimized, by the special sacraments used by Catholic Christians. Pious Protestants sometimes find in their vivid consciousness of the spiritual reality of all nature, and of the divine purpose revealed in all life, a strong argument for doing without special sacramental means of grace. Other Christians, impressed by the truth that the real sphere of religious duty is the common life of every day (so that reconciliation with God is found in a willing acceptance

of God's providence, and in a glad undertaking, as being God's will for us, of the responsibilities and tasks of what is called secular life), fear lest any expectation of special grace in such purely ecclesiastical means as the Sacraments should issue in a separation of religion from life, as though God and His grace are active for our salvation on Sundays in church, and the life of service and adventure and fellowship which is the main concern of all men were without significance for God. But this life, with its warfare and its duty, is a part of eternity; in its opportunities and obligations God is revealed, and His will and His succour. Unless His grace is there, it is nowhere that matters for us. But the general and the special are not opposed; rather do they give meaning to each other. The fact that all life ought to be a fellowship with God is apt to be forgotten unless we make and use special opportunities to make definite and explicit our consciousness of that fellowship, and its meaning for duty and life. Centuries of Christian thought and idealistic speculation have made familiar the idea that God is everywhere. In church, on the hillside, in the thronged market-place, in the hospital ward, in the battle-field, God is everywhere. And for most men there is hardly any difference between "God is everywhere" and "God is nowhere." There is real danger that the man who insists on his communion with God in nature taking the place of His communion with God in church (instead of helping and being helped by it) will either become a mere creature of his moods, or forget who made the flowers and the sunset for His own delight. The man who is so sure that God is in the market-place that he never goes to seek Him in church seems complacently over-confident of his own spiritual insight. "It is quite possible," says Miss Gardner,* "that a glib acquiescence in the statement that 'all life is sacramental' might encourage such a process of secularization as to leave no scope for the recognition of spiritual values." Jesus of Nazareth, who found in nature and in human life a revelation of His Father's love, and a true means of grace, also joined in the fellowship of the synagogue prayers and of the temple sacrifices. The Eucharist, especially, makes the Divine Presence concrete and particular. We must find the meaning of life and duty in the sacrifice and communion of sacramental worship, and the former must give spiritual reality to the latter. The one is not a rival to the other, but rather its inspiration and symbol and explanation.

Baron F. von Hügel has given an impressive statement of the place in Christian thought of the individual and particular. In a letter to Father Tyrrell he says, "Blondel is surely right at

* *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

least where he says that the true Absolute and Universal springs for us from the true Concrete and Particular; God, I like to think with Lotze, is the supremely concrete, supremely individual and particular; and the mental and practical occupation with the particular must ever remain an integral part of my way to Him. And this squares so grandly with the whole sacramental doctrine and practice of the Church. One gets otherwise into a Neo-platonic depersonalizing of the soul."* But this fundamental Christian concern with the individual and particular finds its supreme expression in the Incarnation. All the fullness of the Godhead bodily was revealed in a particular human life. God who is immanent in humanity was incarnate in Man. At a particular moment in time, and at a particular place, in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago, God took hold of humanity in a new, definite, recognizable, unique fashion. The " idea " of the Eucharist is the same as that of the Incarnation. They imply the same method. As St. Justin Martyr put it in the middle of the second century, " we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the invocation of the Word that is from Him . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."† At a definite time, at the time of consecration, in a definite place, on the altar, the Word becomes incarnate again, that in a Sacramental Body He may be present to inspire and uplift, to challenge and strengthen, to make humble and make brave, those who have given themselves to Him, to live for the things for which He lived. In the Sacraments—and the Eucharist is the type—God who in and through the whole physical universe disciplines, and has fellowship with, and gives Himself to, men, does specially, and in what one may call an obviously personal way (for personality is usually revealed in what is unique and particular, rather than in the general and universal), give Himself to His children. The life of mankind misrepresents, almost as much as it reveals, the God who is its source and its goal; but the whole meaning of the life of Jesus is God. So nature, with its cruelty and waste as well as its beauty and law, is a veil drawn over the face of God; but the Sacraments respond to man's need for " some pure untroubled element which has no significancy except as the organ through which the voice of God speaks to man ";‡ they have no meaning unless they are the means which God has appointed§ by which men may have fellowship with Him and lay hold on the eternal order.

* *George Tyrrell's Letters*, p. 44.

† *First Apology*, chapter lxvi. Dr. Waterman's translation.

‡ F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ* (edit. 1883), vol. ii., p. 87.

§ In St. Augustine's phrase they are *signa data*, not *naturalia ; res* and *signum* are arbitrarily conjoined (*De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 1)

It is, then, no mere accident of history that the Sacraments are rooted in the Incarnation, that they are, as the catechism puts it, "ordained by Christ Himself." Neither is it a mere trick of the human mind which brings about (what undoubtedly occurs) that an a-sacramental or anti-sacramental religion inevitably tends to Unitarianism. The Sacraments are "the extension of the Incarnation."

II.

All earth is a parable, and a miracle as well.

"That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural." From the necessities of human development, the spiritual has to be expressed in thoughts and words, whose origin and customary reference belong to the external and material world. In many languages, for example, the original meaning of the word used for "spirit" is "breath." That means that religion is always partly inarticulate. The ideal eludes analysis, and even the truest and most adequate definition of the Divine half conceals, even if it half reveals, the ineffable Reality. The truth of dogma is "symbolic" or "prophetic," to use Tyrrell's words. Professor J. B. Pratt, in his great book on *The Religious Consciousness*, quotes "A Catholic priest" as saying: "Dogmas are a kind of intellectual sacrament—that is, intellectual and imaginative signs of realities that are supra-intellectually cognized by the deep dim intuitive apprehension of faith; and they well may be called a kind of sacrament, for they are effectual signs—that is, they tend to generate or elicit, in the mind which receptively apprehends them, that very vision of faith which they so inadequately express and attempt to communicate."* All speech about the spiritual world must be non-literal; it is not, therefore, fanciful, or imaginary, or unreal.† God always speaks to His children in symbols, metaphors, allegories, or parables; but the symbol is more true, not less true, than any attempted exact definition. The Incarnation itself is a parable or symbol of God's love for, and desire to touch, the world; and the Eucharist is the parable or allegory of a more unrestricted activity of redemption than was possible in Galilee and Judæa.‡ When Jülicher called the Eucharist an "acted parable" he was stating a great truth. The Lord's Supper and the Lord's parables illuminate each other.

It was fitting that He who was the *Incarnate* Word should

* Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

† *Cf.* L. Waterman, *The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood*, p. 166.

‡ Waterman, *op. cit.*, pp. 61, 72.

clothe His message in terms of actual life. He shows the ideal taking shape in the common relations of every day, the eternal embodied in "the trivial round, the common task." Not in terms of intellect, but in terms of nature and humanity, He *shows* us God. The heart of Christ's message is bound up with the reason why He used fishing-nets, and lost sheep, and patched coats, and women sweeping their houses, as the means by which He brought home the truth of God to the will and conscience of men. He made these concrete, commonplace things symbols of the eternal, sacraments of grace and light. The words that He spoke are pictures, and that is one reason why they are spirit and life. These glimpses of real humanity shining with the glory of an ideal divine meaning are part of the same revelation as the Incarnation, where humanity becomes most Divine, and God becomes most human, and as the Eucharist, where bread and wine become the channel and instrument of His Mystical Presence. That is why, "without a parable He spake nothing unto them: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken. . . . I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world."*

The parables are religion, not theology. They spring out of the vital, continuous experience of the Father which was the background of all Christ's life, the context of every word that He spoke, the motive of every action, the home in which He was at peace. And if men can stop analyzing the parables, or trying to explain them, or moralizing about them, if they will only yield themselves in simplicity to their simple appeal, they will feel the deep things of the spirit, and what is too real for words will remind them that it will not be ignored. God ceases to be the conclusion of an argument; He is an Experience, a Friend. The strange hopes and shames of the spirit of man are clothed, not in logical statements, but in living, breathing flesh. Windows are opened into heaven. These stories move men to penitence and hope. The reality of religion is in them. They touch the deepest and most real in every man, not the mind alone, not the emotion alone, but the very springs of motive, the sources of action. Much religious instruction (all theorizing and theology, and nearly all moral exhortation) fails just here. It cannot purify the motives, it cannot change the will, it gives no power to realize the ideals it expounds. But just in so far as men yield to the appeal and influence of Christ's parables, they will find this obstinate inward conflict reconciled. "The Word became Flesh," and all His teaching has the completeness, the intimacy, the tangible vitality of the living Humanity which is body and spirit as well. The In-

* St. Matt. xiii. 34, 35.

carnate Word spoke nothing without a parable. This throws fresh light on the Holy Eucharist, which is in some sense the greatest of all parables, and is also really the extension of the Incarnation. When He blessed the Bread and the Wine He was declaring things hidden from the foundation of the world.

At the Holy Table men and women are admitted to religious experience at its most simple and most exalted, in its least intellectualized, aspect. This is not talk about religion, but the spiritual reality itself; the Shepherd leads us in green pastures, and by the waters of peace. All that the most eloquent preachers have tried in vain to describe, all that theology seeks to explain and rationalize, the Reality which the beauty of a noble church hints at, the mystery of the altar cross and the lights and the silence of adoration, the Presence that children can feel and the wisest cannot understand, the Fellowship that makes the proud ashamed and sends the selfish out to serve his brethren and the worldling to seek for the things that are not seen—the mystic channel of this Divine experience is through the consecrated elements, the Bread and the Wine that Christ uses for the comfort and sustenance of His own.

Christ has taken common everyday things and made them channels of grace. "This exaltation of the homeliest act of life to its great spiritual significance," Miss Gardner points out,* "is an illustration of the greater appeal to the heart made by symbol than by what seems to have no mystery about it." This is the meaning of His life, that ordinary things are divine, that simple things are like God, that wild flowers are more glorious than the pomp of a king's court, that boys and girls play in the streets of the City of God, that the Son of God wore a workman's coat, that a fisherman may be His apostle, that every supper-table may be the Table of the Lord, that all earthly things are *meant* to reveal the spiritual, and eternal, and divine. That is why they are here. "All meals are sacraments, really," says C. E. Montague,† "only some vulgarization of them, or of us, repels us at most times; we cannot communicate." Christ has consecrated, made divine, what men have vulgarized. The material things which they have debased and degraded, He uses for the praise of God. The food that men eat so carelessly, so wastefully, so ungratefully, so wickedly, becomes the Body of the Lord; the wine they have drunk so thoughtlessly becomes His Blood. So Love redeems the material universe.

Christ did a dangerous thing when He took bread, and gave it to His disciples, and said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." He asked men to eat together as a token of fellowship. From

* *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

† *The Hind Let Loose.*

one point of view, that is in the broad human tradition. Men have always feasted together as a mark of friendship. But the Lord Jesus was an Oriental, and in the East this matter of eating together is surrounded by all sorts of ancestral tabus and ancient jealousies and fierce contempts and obscure racial antagonisms. How careful an Arab is before He will eat salt with a man! And the nerve of brotherhood is cut by all that is summed up, in India, in the word "caste," and the caste-rules are in nothing more obtrusive than in this matter of eating with others. Christ was provoking wild prejudice and hatred when, as a sacrament of an universal religion, He put a common meal. There were once sharp words between great apostles on this very question of eating in common.* The fellowship of the Church is founded in divisions transcended, in ancestral tabus deliberately broken, in an appeal to the one blood of all the nations of the earth. He uses the occasion of strife as a sacrament of communion.

But if the Bread was dangerous, it is almost impossible to realize the social and religious whirlpool into which the Lord Jesus launched the disciples when He said, "This is My Blood." The very thought of drinking blood sends a shudder of horror through every normal human being. The foulest stories were told, indeed, in Rome during the early centuries about the blood-drinking at Christian meetings. Among the Jews this instinctive horror becomes definite and explicit in the demands of their religion. And, as though there were not enough of danger and prejudice here, it was wine that Christ consecrated to be His Blood. Wine makes glad the heart of man, and brings sadness and poverty. Wine is the symbol of fellowship and hospitality, and the occasion of quarrelling and strife. Wine uplifts, and casts down into brutishness and devilry. Wine that is a temptation (there are few more dangerous) Christ makes into a sacrament. Men will not face this paradox. They water it down, and explain it away. It has been suggested that it was not fermented wine that He used. But this is a gratuitous assumption, for which there is not a shred of evidence. The Lord Jesus was called a wine-bibber, a jibe that would have been impossible unless He had been in the habit of drinking intoxicants. Or, more reasonably, people say that wine was not the temptation in that country, and at that time, that it is here and now. But all the evidence points in the opposite direction. The Old Testament and the New have many references to the evil of drunkenness, and to the temptation of strong drink; and not even in the Bible do preachers denounce evils, and warn against temptations, which are not real for their

* See Gal. ii. 11*ff*.

audience. Moreover, Latin writers of the first and second centuries have left descriptions of drunkenness and debauchery unsurpassed in the world's literature. However difficult it may be to understand, the fact stands out clearly that Christ took this thing which might almost be called the prototype of all temptation, and made it into a sacrament. There is nothing so dangerous, so fraught with possibilities of destruction, so intimately associated with the worst passions and indulgences of frail humanity, that Jesus Christ cannot consecrate it, and use it, and make it a positive, redeeming, strengthening element in human life.

That the Holy Eucharist is the expression and confirmation of the implicit sacramentalism of the visible world also becomes apparent from its relation to the pagan mysteries, at Eleusis and elsewhere. The Eucharist is the "Christian mysteries," without which the Græco-Roman world would hardly have considered the Church a religion at all.* The word *sacramentum* first appears in Christian use, not primarily to mean a soldier's oath, but as the translation of the Greek μυστήριον,† and early apologists recognize the similarity between the pagan and Christian services, for they stigmatize the pagan mysteries as counterfeits, constructed by demons in imitation of the Holy Eucharist.‡ There is abundant evidence that the development of Christian doctrine, as early as the Apostolic age and as late as the middle of the third century, was much influenced by the practice and vocabulary of the mystery religions, which proved to be an important *preparatio evangelica*. As it was sacrilege for an initiate to divulge the secrets of the "mystery," many points about them are still obscure. But the essence of the mystery seems to have been that after moral and ceremonial purification,§ the initiate was admitted to see enacted a dramatic representation which made clear the symbolic meaning of the life of the god. At Eleusis, for example, was presented in symbols the story of Demeter and Persephone‖ (by the former of whom the mysteries were said to have been instituted), a story in which nature symbolism was very near the surface. "Processes which ever repeat themselves in nature, and by the repetition of which we live; processes behind which is God were represented as the movement of the Divine life, represented by a procession of symbolic acts and words."¶ And then the worshipper was allowed to handle the Divine

* A. Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church*, p. 226.

† T. A. Lacey: Article "Sacraments, Christian (Western)," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. x., p. 903.

‡ Tertullian, *De Præscr.* 40.

§ Miss Jane Harrison derives μυστήριον from μύσος=filth. See her *Prolegomena to Greek Religion.*

‖ Walter Pater, *Greek Studies*, p. 122. ¶ G. A. Johnston Ross.

symbols, and at last to taste them. He asserted as his own the Divine life. "The mystery was an acted parable of the relation of the spirit of man to the Divine basis of the world."* In its more developed form, the mystery aimed at being a religion of salvation, an "effectual sign" of union with a God who shares the life of man, asserting such a Divine interest in a man's affairs as would sustain him through the difficulties of life, developing and emphasizing his hope of immortality, and giving the only clear statement in Greek popular religion of the idea of personal holiness.

The Holy Eucharist, then, is fitly called "these holy mysteries," not because it is vague, sentimental, other-worldly, but because it is a channel of union with God, a drama of the life of God, and an assertion of the believer's oneness with Him. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that no thought has been more closely associated with the Eucharist than the hope of immortality. Ignatius called the Lord's Supper "the medicine of immortality," and this connection doubtless goes back to the great sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. They who eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood have eternal life (St. John vi. 54). They become one with that which they partake.

Tertullian calls the Eucharist "the theatre of the pious," and the movement of the liturgy represents the successive stages of Christ's self-offering; it is "the story of the actual career of Jesus, told as it were in holy pantomime."† At the oblation of the elements He offers Himself in Gethsemane; at the consecration His Body is broken and His Blood shed; at the "commixtio" His Resurrection is recorded, so that it is the crucified *and living* Christ on whom His worshippers are fed.‡ All the meaning of the life of Christ, all its Divine revelation, is summed up here, in a broken Body and Blood shed. Death, self-giving, love—these are the life of God. Eating, men say, "I and my Father are one," one in will, one in purpose. They pledge themselves to the ideal which the mystic expressed in the words, "I am Thou and Thou art I."

A. E. Baker.

* P. Gardner: Article "Mysteries (Greek)," *E. R. E.*, vol. ix., p. 77.

† Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystic Way.*

‡ W. H. Frere, *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, chap. ii.; Neale and Littledale, *Liturgies of SS. Mark, James, and Clement*, pp. xxi.–xl.; and a full bibliography in Hirn, *The Sacred Shrine.* This view of the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass was common in the Middle Ages, and is found in a MS. prepared by the commission, appointed in 1540, which issued *The King's Book.* See Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, vol. ii., p. 120.

(To be concluded.)

NEW MOVEMENT IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

In the last three years a society has been founded in the German Lutheran communion, and is called the High-Church Union. It includes among its members a number of Lutheran pastors from different parts of Germany, and publishes in Berlin a monthly journal entitled *Die Hoch-Kirche* ("The High-Church"). We may be inclined to ask, "Can any good come out of Berlin?" But a careful study of the publications of this society may show that it deserves at least our sympathy and moral support. It will therefore be desirable to give the exposition of the principles of the High-Church Union accepted at the inaugural meeting of members at Berlin, October 9, 1918, and published with the sanction of the Executive Committee:

The High-Church Union aims at a *reorganization of the Churches of the Reformation* as regards their *constitution* and *worship*. They invite to co-operation all those who stand on the basis of the Gospel and earnestly wish to be Christians.

I.

1. The High-Church Union aims at the full independence of these Churches in church matters and management. They should be prevented by no considerations from upholding emphatically loyalty to the gospel and church interests amongst themselves, and towards the outside world, whatever may be the place or persons with whom they are concerned.

2. Further, they consider as desirable the establishment of the *episcopal constitution*, which thoroughly agrees with the spirit of Holy Scripture.

II.

1. The High-Church Union desires a considerable diminution in preaching, *a stronger stress* on the meaning of the Holy Sacraments and their objective character. Their administration according to church order is an indispensable presupposition. There should also be a *richer liturgical reorganization of church services.*

2. They will work to this end, that in Divine service (through decoration of church and altar, music, richer ornaments, etc.) the feeling for what is beautiful, noble, and really popular should be taken more into account and the sacred content of truth should always be presented in sacred and dignified forms.

3. They regard an active *reform of the practice of Confession and Communion*, even as it is now carried on, as indispensable and the reintroduction of voluntary private confession as desirable.

4. They wish to assist in the work, that pious practices (church attendance, hours of prayer, *evangelical community life*) should be duly valued and observed even in the Churches of the Reformation.

5. They regard as one of their tasks the composition of a *breviary* for evangelical Christians.

6. Because the Church is for them the visible system of salvation which was founded by Christ and the Apostles, they must strive for a greater influence, corresponding with its importance, on the life of the people, and the consciousness of belonging to the *universal Church of Christ* must be stimulated and strengthened.

Such, then, are the general principles enunciated by the representatives of the High-Church Union, and they are elaborated in successive numbers of *Die Hoch-Kirche*. The questions which are of the greatest importance and interest to Anglican scholars are the doctrines of the Sacraments and of the Church, and these are fully discussed. The suggestions with regard to community life and the composition of an evangelical breviary may be of some value in view of the increase of religious communities in the English Church and of the proposed revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Still, it is the statement of the doctrines of the Sacraments and of the Church which demand the fullest consideration.

The doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is discussed in two articles, one by an evangelical pastor, the other by a Roman Catholic professor of theology at Munich.

The first writer holds a middle position between the Roman Catholic doctrine and the Zwinglian view. He denies that the Sacrifice in the Eucharist is a continuation, repetition, or renewal of the Sacrifice on Calvary, or a propitiatory sacrifice. On the other hand, he rejects the Zwinglian view that there is no sacrifice, but only a memorial of the suffering and death of Christ. He asserts that the Holy Communion is the Church's great sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Besides the presentation of bread and wine and the faithful devotion of the congregation to God, there is the presentation of the consecrated elements as a representation of the sacrifice of Christ. The oldest tradition of the Christian Church shows that there was a continuous setting forth of the one perfect and sufficient Sacrifice. The writer points out also that all that our Lord does immediately and personally in heaven, He also does on earth through the mediation of His Church symbolically, but still spiritually and really.

The article closes with an interesting quotation from the Declaration of the Utrecht Conference of the Old-Catholic bishops (1889):

"The Eucharistic feast of the Church is not a continuous repetition or renewal of the propitiatory sacrifice, which Christ offered once for all on the cross, but its sacrificial character consists in this, that it is the permanent memorial of the same, and the real representation, on earth, of that one offering of

Christ for redeemed mankind, which is continuously made by Christ in heaven, as He now appears for us in the presence of God."

The second writer discusses the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the Roman Catholic standpoint. The institution was a sacrificial act, not, as Professor Harnack says, only a sacrifice of prayer, a sacrificial act of the congregation. The Mass is not a *sacrificium absolutum*, but a *sacrificium relativum*, a representation or sacramental repetition of the Sacrifice on the Cross. The Mass is the very same sacrifice. The gift is the same, the Body of Christ; the Priest is the same, Christ Himself, who acts through the earthly priest as His representative. He points out that Luther adhered to the doctrine of the Real Presence, but, by the rejection of the Mass, removed the sacrifice from the service of his Church. On these two points he quotes the significant comments of Professor Harnack. On the first, Harnack says, "Luther strays more and more into the Catholic conception." On the second he observes, "It is a tremendous revolution in the history of religion, for there has never yet been a religion in which the idea of sacrifice did not dominate the life of religion." We may content ourselves by observing that Luther in the early stages of the Reformation was nearer to Catholicism than his friends and most of his followers. In that case, the members of the High-Church Union are going back to Luther, or are pressing on beyond him to a Catholic conception of the Holy Eucharist.

Let us pass on now to their conception of the nature of the Church and its government. The Church is the visible institution founded by Christ and His Apostles. The statement of Professor Weinel, that Jesus never thought of founding a Church, and the idea of the Church or Kingdom of God as a future power are both rejected. The foundation of the Church is proved by two facts, the call of twelve Apostles and the institution of the Lord's Supper. The Christian *ecclesia* corresponds to the Jewish *qahal*, the people of God. Christ is present in the Church, which is an organism or body, and manifests Himself by holy actions, such as Baptism and Holy Communion. He administers the Church through the offices of Apostles, Bishops, and others. The Church is visible, because it consists of those who have been baptized, and the visible Church and the pastoral office have an immediate and independent sanction from God. All this contradicts Luther's theory that the Church is to be defined as the communion of saints—*i.e.*, believers—and therefore the Church is invisible, because faith is invisible. Some of the Reformers, no doubt, reached a compromise by taking the Church in the narrower

and broader sense (*ecclesia proprie et late dicta*). The invisible Church was the community of believers: the visible Church was the number of the baptized.

The High-Church Union appears to be averse to State control, though they do not press for disestablishment. National Churches, they say, are under the dominion of the State, and the independence of the Church should be strengthened. In another place it is said that the separation of Church and State is not to be aimed at, for they are mutually connected with one another.

Their views on Church government are less strong and definite than they might be. An article on "The Apostolic Succession," by R. F. Littledale, is reprinted in a translation, but another writer inclines to a theory of *successio pastoralis*. The "pastorate" is the apostleship on its permanent side. Bishops are pastors with wider functions of Church government. Still, they aim at the episcopal office, and declare that future evangelical Bishops should not lack the apostolic succession as they (the Catholics) understand it.

We must deal very briefly with other questions, such as private confession, community life, and the evangelical breviary. It is pointed out that Luther retained and recommended private confession, but its decay was inevitable, because its official character was lost. Where every believer was constituted a priest, there was no fundamental need for confession or absolution through another person. The High-Church Union, however, claims that the *institution* of private confession is necessary to advise and direct the people. Emphasis is laid on the institution, for only when an orderly arrangement is made, and the opportunity in God's House is offered at definite hours, can the care of souls lose the accidental and fortuitous character, which is now attached to it, when it is limited to house-to-house visiting.

With regard to community life, we are reminded that Luther spoke very highly of "The Brethren of the Common Life," that community which was established at Deventer about 1380, and numbered among its members Thomas à Kempis and Gerlac Petersen. The ideal of these evangelical communities should be the imitation of Christ, as Thomas à Kempis proclaimed it. The three counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience, are favourably considered, but definite vows and religious enclosure are not demanded. The brethren of the Order should be appointed as confessors. Besides this, a scheme for a brotherhood of evangelical "Tertiaries" is outlined. The evangelical breviary should contain services for three hours: the morning hour, compiled from Matins, Lauds,

and Prime; the midday hour, from Terce, Sext, and None; and the evening hour, from Vespers and Compline.

It would not be possible to examine in detail the liturgy proposed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper; but at least it can be said that a form of absolution, the Creed, and a Consecration Prayer which should express the thought of sacrifice, are regarded as essential parts of the service. The vestments of the ministers should be cassock, alb, stole, of different colours, according to the Church's seasons, and some vestment resembling a chasuble or a cope.

Last of all, we must draw attention to a remarkable composition called "Goads and Nails: 95 Theses against the errors and abuses of our time." It is a vigorous counterblast to the 95 Theses, which Luther nailed on the door of the church at Wittenberg. The writer criticizes severely the Reformation. It gave an impetus to much good, but also was the cause of much deterioration. In other words, it drove out one devil, and let in seven other worse spirits. It may rightly be called a deformation, because its well-meant efforts were, to a great extent, misdirected. A reformation of the old Church was then necessary, but that which took place was a failure. The rest of the theses may be conveniently summed up under four heads: (*a*) Catholicity; (*b*) infallibility; (*c*) visibility of the Church; (*d*) papal supremacy.

(*a*) Protestantism must return, not, indeed, to the Roman Church, but to Catholicity. It is essential to the Church of Jesus Christ that it is Catholic; if it is not, it has no claim to be a true Church. The Roman and Greek Churches belong to the true Church, because they are Catholic; the Protestants belong to the true Church, in so far as they are conscious of being Catholic Christians. In so far as the Protestant Churches have lost their Catholicity, they have fallen away from the true Church of Christ.

(*b*) The Church is infallible as a whole, but infallibility is not in a single man, because the Holy Spirit and all His gifts can never be found at once in a single man, with the exception of the Son of God, when He walked on earth.

(*c*) It is one-sided to think of the Church simply as an invisible community of believers; it is just as absurd as if the really patriotic citizens were to be designated as the invisible State. The Church is the outward and visible community of those who call themselves Christians; it is also admitted that the true believers form the inward, invisible, living nucleus of the Church.

(*d*) While the Church as the visible kingdom of God in the world needs visible leadership, and the episcopal constitution

is definitely in accordance with the spirit of antiquity and Holy Scripture, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome is a doctrine which cannot be supported by historic or biblical, but only by sophistical, arguments. A primacy of any one bishop *honoris causa* and according to human right, can be allowed in certain circumstances, but is not absolutely necessary.

We may briefly refer to a following article on true Catholicity. The writer points out, first of all, that the Reformed doctrines of the Sacraments and of Predestination are not Catholic (according to the canon of Vincent of Lerins), and that the Lutheran Church is not Catholic in its consistorial constitution, its territorialism (*cujus regio, ejus religio*), and its loss of moral discipline. He shows then that Catholicity has a twofold application: (1) It is the communion of the kingdom of grace, of which the visible signs are the Apostles' Creed and Baptism. (2) It is the divinely ordained doctrine and order, which should be the bond of Christendom for all places and all time. Catholic doctrine is the doctrine, as it was preached by the Apostles. The Œcumenical episcopate and the historical continuity of the office (to which the truth of the apostolic succession is related) is a Catholic feature, and, indeed, a feature which supports and guarantees Catholicity—the bond of communion. The "Puseyites" are perfectly right, in restoring full value to this Catholic feature; they are wrong in regarding it as the only or highest feature.

The disposition towards Catholicity leads to the recognition of other Churches as such. It calls for a renewed conscientious examination of our (the Lutheran) position, both towards the Reformed and towards the Roman Catholic Church. The advantages of the Roman Church are recognized, especially its independence of secular authority. Yet it is not free from error and false development. The Pope has falsely arrogated to himself the vicegerency of Christ; but he has never robbed Christ of honour. Still, the divinely authorized supremacy over Christendom in spiritual as well as in secular matters is rejected. An incorruptible sense for Divine truth is the true Catholicity. The mission of the German people is this: From them issued the separation of the Church, and in them alone lie the seeds of reunion, if they remain true to the spirit of their own Reformation.

Such, then, in broad outline, are the views of the High-Church Union. They appear to deserve our sympathy, and, so far as we can give it, our practical support. For instance, they have formed a *Church Times* reading-circle, the members of which are asked to send in translations of articles in the *Church Times*, suitable for insertion in *Die Hoch-Kirche*. Would it not

be possible to supply the High-Church Union with free or used copies of the *Church Times?*

Two other practical questions will no doubt suggest themselves to the minds of our readers:

(1) Are the clerical members of the High-Church Union merely "free lances," or have they any considerable following in their respective congregations?

(2) If they desire episcopal ordination, from whom will they get their orders?

There are, we know, Old-Catholic Bishops at Bonn in Germany, Berne in Switzerland, and also in Holland. National sentiment will probably dispose them to seek orders from a Bishop of their own nationality. If they do so, will their orders be considered valid by other episcopal communions? The same or similar problems confront the Church of England in her attitude towards non-episcopal bodies at home. The problem is not ultimately insoluble, but it can only be solved in a spirit of patience and mutual charity. Whatever may be the outcome of these movements, the writer of this article would like to record his conviction that the hope of the future lies in a gradual and progressive tendency towards true and essential Catholicism.

L. PATTERSON.

ON THE WRITING OF BOOKS ON MORAL THEOLOGY

AN IGNORANT MAN'S COMPLAINT

A BOOK appeared a short time ago on the subject of Moral Theology which was very favourably reviewed, and which many people considered to be the best book that had been written on the subject from the Anglican standpoint. Shortly after its publication the present writer discussed it with two persons—one a parish priest of exceptionally wide reading, and the other one of the best known of the younger Anglican theologians. Each of them said the same thing, that he had begun the book, and had given it up after a few chapters as tedious and useless. Now that two such men should be affected in such a way by a book that had been so generally praised seemed a fact that demanded careful consideration, and the present article is an attempt to explain their attitude, or at least to explain that of the parish priest.

The first point one notices is that the clergy who read at all

are almost invariably either bored by books on Moral Theology (including systematic treatises on Pastoral Theology) or enthusiastic readers of them. The intermediate class is either small or non-existent. The clergy who welcome such books might be described generally as self-conscious.* This description is not meant to be a hostile one. These men realize that Anglican priests are as a rule well-meaning amateurs, who carry out a number of duties which custom or tradition has associated with their office, and they doubt both whether the duties are carried out efficiently, and also how far they are such as ought to be carried out at all. They are well aware that the average man does not treat the priest, as he does the architect or doctor, as a professional expert, and they have an uneasy feeling that his attitude is not unjustified. Hence they welcome with an almost pathetic eagerness any book that attempts to give a more systematic form to clerical work.

I venture to suggest that this desire to have clerical work made more professional and systematic is strengthened by the existence amongst the "self-conscious" clergy of a general dislike of the popular conception of the parson as the "professional good man." I imagine that those who dislike this conception usually regard it as a product of Puritanism or of the Evangelical Revival. This is, however, certainly not the case; the idea, indeed, seems to be almost a permanent part of the mental furniture of the English layman. It would be easy to give a catena of quotations to prove this statement; perhaps it will suffice if I remind my readers that five centuries ago a layman's conception of a good parish priest was:

> This noble ensample to his sheep he yaf,
> That first he wroghte, and afterward he taughte;
>
> To drawen folk to heven by fairnesse,
> By good ensample, was his bisinesse:
>
> But Cristes lore, and his apostles twelve,
> He taughte, and first he folwed it himselve.

Much though we may be affected by stories of French villagers spitting at the curé and then crowding in to Mass, I think we must recognize that only an operation on the English skull would produce a similar state of affairs in this country. To those of us who know ourselves, it is hardly cheering to feel that it is the personal holiness of the priest which does most to produce success in his work; yet in England that seems to be the case, and we shall not alter the fact by being unwilling to admit it.

* This phrase is not altogether a happy one, but I hope the succeeding sentences will make the sense in which I use it clear. I quite recognize that probably the majority of the best of the clergy are "self-conscious" rather than "healthy-minded."

The clergy who do not read books on Moral Theology are, in William James's sense, healthy-minded. They are satisfied that they have a sufficiently good practical conception of the nature of their function and the scope of their work, and their only desire is that their working efficiency should be increased. One would be inclined to suggest that the study of Moral Theology should have this effect. To try to show why the average "healthy-minded" clergyman would not consider this to be the case, I wish to describe a conversation with one Ignoramus, a parish priest of this type, about Mr. Kirk's book. (It must, of course, have been obvious to every reader that this is the book I have in mind.)

Ignoramus suffers somewhat from the effects of a diligent study he made as an undergraduate of the works of Mr. Chesterton; so I was not surprised when he began by saying that he thought the objections to books on Moral Theology were (*a*) that there was no such subject, and that the creation of one appeared to him to involve a marriage not made in heaven; (*b*) that the writers had read too much; and (*c*) that such books tended to make their readers live in a world of (Platonic) ideas. Pressed to put the matter into a form more suited to his hearer's Victorian mentality, he said that he thought the nature of the Christian character was a matter which could only be satisfactorily dealt with by a philosopher, while such questions as the factors producing conversion and the means by which the development of the Christian character could be aided belonged rather to the sphere of the psychologist. It was just as unlikely that one man should be able satisfactorily to treat both subjects as that Clerk Maxwell, the mathematician who worked out the theory of electric waves, should have made a successful Managing Director of the Marconi Company.

The result of trying to make these two subjects into one, Ignoramus went on, was that one got at once too little and too much. Ignoramus has confessed to me that the one type of question he gets at his men's class to which he does not give a frank answer is that which leads to problems connected with Freewill and Determinism. Naturally, therefore, he almost foamed at the mouth when speaking of the airy way in which such matters as freewill and conscience were dismissed, without any mention even of the difference between psychological and ultimate freedom. He felt, too, highly dissatisfied with the writer's postulates, particularly with that stating the objectivity of spiritual experience. "If," he said, "you interpret ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν in a Platonic sense, as I think the whole prologue requires, I am not at all sure that communion with man's highest self is not most emphatically communion

with God. In fact," he went on, " the writer's ' postulates ' are propositions, and far from obvious ones."

" I can't help feeling, too," he continued, " that practical difficulties are rather funked. I know the book is called *Principles*, but surely it ought to carry its application of them to a point where it gives some help to the parish priest in dealing with the more serious present-day difficulties, such things, for instance, as the attitude of Christians towards war and the competitive system, or the problems raised in connection with sex and marriage by present-day conditions. At times, in reading the book, I was haunted by a horrible fear, quite unjustified I hope, that there was another unstated postulate, that where the Medieval Church held a general opinion on such points we were bound by it, and where it did not we could take what view we liked. But if that is not the case, surely the writer could well have spared some of the pages he devotes to the classification of virtues, and to discussions such as whether some particular thing should be included under faith or under love, for the consideration of these problems."

I do not give Ignoramus' criticisms of the practical part of the work here, because he largely repeated them later in describing his own ideal of a book. He went on to his second point, that the book contained too much. He said that while he was greatly impressed by the learning of the author, and the wealth of material he had drawn upon, he was inclined to think there was an imperfect synthesis. He thought that it would be found that the various authorities quoted differed from one another in underlying assumptions, conscious or unconscious, and in mental outlook, to an extent which made their systems at certain points mutually incompatible, and that their opinions on any point could only be profitably compared when each opinion was considered in the light of the whole system of the authority concerned.

Ignoramus also thought that when so vast a range was taken it was almost impossible to avoid lapses, and he gave as an example what he called " the somewhat startling description of William James as ' the chief supporter of the doctrine of healthy-mindedness.' "

" Well," I said, " about your third point ?" " Do you remember," Ignoramus replied, " how Charles Lamb defends the Restoration comedies by arguing that they obviously deal, not with actual life, but with a world in which the conventions and ideas differ entirely from those of the real world ? Well, I think it is most difficult, in trying to escape from our rule-of-thumb and haphazard methods, not at times to introduce an artificially simple and regular world. Much can be done, and ought to be done, to systematize our work, but we must never

forget that our success, like that of a general practitioner in medicine, depends largely on our power to individualize each case. It is always easier to study systems than souls, and we old fogies are rather afraid that some of the clergy try to fit their people into Procrustean beds. The kind of book that will help us is one that will give a careful study of the difficulties we Anglican priests actually do meet with."

"Suppose," I said, "you tell me what you think such a book should contain." Ignoramus laughed. "That is not so easy as to say what I don't want," he replied, "but it's a fair question. Firstly, as I say, I think the subject should be divided. I won't attempt to deal with the philosophical side. The practical book should, I think, simply state quite clearly what the writer is assuming, and give references to books on Christian Ethics. If it does anything more, it should only examine certain special problems which are of urgent practical difficulty. The main body of the book should be based on a consideration of the actual position and opportunities of the Anglican pastor. To begin with, we must realize that our public ministrations are one of the principal opportunities in the English Church of exercising religious influence. The book should, therefore, study carefully, from the standpoint of Group Psychology, how the atmosphere can be produced in our services which will forward the conversion of sinners and the careless and advance the spiritual life of believers. Very few of the clergy know anything about the application of suggestion to crowds.

"The second important point, and it is here that my remark about the Procrustean bed particularly applies, is that our people are not in general a docile body who will come to us for spiritual censure or absolution. For the most part, we have to go out and seek the sheep. Our success in bringing them into the fold will depend primarily on our personal holiness, but it will also be greatly assisted by our having made a sufficiently prolonged study of the psychology of religion to enable us to diagnose quickly and accurately each person's spiritual state, and to know how best to approach him. It does appear to me that Mr. Kirk's treatment of this part of his subject is very superficial.

"Then, with regard to the people who do come to us for guidance, the important fact to observe is that a large proportion of them will correspond to those who only call in the doctor when really dangerously ill. They will be critical cases, in which the least mishandling may do deadly harm. Here, again, I think an exact knowledge of psychology is of the first importance, and I hold, in spite of the sentence from Dr. Hadfield quoted in Mr. Kirk's preface which seems to advocate

a contrary view, that one has frequently to deal with repressed complexes." Ignoramus then gave me one or two remarkable instances of this, but said he was compelled to ask me not to publish them in case the persons concerned could be identified. "I thoroughly agree with," he went on, "and always follow, the advice Mr. Kirk gives in his preface that 'the priest should never undertake the treatment of abnormal spiritual conditions without taking expert medical advice'—except that I should like to underline the word 'expert.'"

"If I ever had to lecture on Pastoral Theology," Ignoramus continued, "I should begin with the different types of religious experience, starting by a careful analysis of conversion, and going on to Protestant and Catholic types of saintliness; I should then deal with the repressed complexes the parish priest was most likely to meet with, and I should conclude with a discussion of the use of suggestion with individuals and with crowds, and of other aspects of Group Psychology which affect our work."

"I think the first result of your course would be the production of a set of young curates who saw repressed sexuality in the way their Sunday-school teachers shook hands or blew their noses," I replied.

"Quite so," he replied, "but, in the first place, that would be less dangerous than their seeing nothing but sweet feminine saintliness, and in the second, when they grew out of their first wild rapture and recovered their balance, they would be left with most valuable knowledge."

"Why don't you write an article giving your views?" I said. "Why don't you," he replied. "You are more used to rushing into print than I am." And though I consider his last remark as slanderous, I have written the article, having failed to persuade him to do so. I have tried to represent his views faithfully, though perhaps I have in places rather developed his arguments. Much of what he said I agree with, though I could find many points to criticize. I feel, particularly, that he does not realize the value of the mass of information contained in the classical Moral Theology about the development of the Christian character. I am, however, quite incompetent to criticize Ignoramus. My purpose in writing is simply to call attention to the fact that there exist a number of parish priests such as he, intelligent and widely read, who have little or no use for the subject of Moral Theology as it has hitherto been presented. I should be very glad to hear how far students of the subject consider the criticisms of Ignoramus justified; and most of all I should like to know whether the learned and fair-minded author of the book himself agrees with any of his points.

F. G. Chevassut.

INDUSTRIAL IDEALS

ACCORDING to newspaper reports the Bishop of Birmingham made an arresting speech at Mürren during the August holidays. His Lordship found his sympathies for the middle classes deepening. When he considered the workers, he is reported to have said: "Owing to the fact that workmen received so much consideration with regard to hours of labour, wages, insurance, amount of work to be done per day, and education for their children, many, instead of developing strength of character, had weakened in their sense of responsibility." Such a pronouncement, from such a source, urges one to look into the developments of the past few decades and to consider some of the policies and ideals that are being pressed upon this country during this period of reconstruction.

The present condition of affairs in our industrial life has been developing since what is known as the Industrial Revolution occurred during the latter half of the eighteenth century. With the invention of the steam-engine and the consequent use of power-driven machinery, the whole current of industrial life was changed. To obtain the full advantages of the new possibility, the large factory employing hundreds, or even thousands, of operatives replaced the old cottage system of manufacture. The industrial town took the place of the small manufacturing town or village, and as these new towns in many cases sprang up with mushroom-like rapidity at points conveniently situated for supplies of coal and iron, and with facilities for distributing their products, many new and unusual problems evolved. A factory might be established in fairly open country, the operatives needed to live near their work. Thus cottages were built near the factory or mill, without any consideration as to "town-planning" entering the heads of those who were responsible. Straggling streets with every inch of available land under contribution as sites for the dwellings of the rapidly increasing industrial army, led inevitably to the creation of slums and all that slum life entails. There was an extraordinary amount of chaos, socially and industrially.

To the political and industrial leaders of the nation the possibility of producing and accumulating wealth was the outstanding feature of this new epoch in our national life. Seldom has a more interesting or a more difficult position faced any people. The very foundations of life for a growing mass of the population were shifting; nor was the movement so

gradual that statesmanship could be expected to guide it safely through the early days of the transition. For the transition was far too rapid, and the changes too radical, to permit of the application of any known and tested policy. Here, indeed, was one of the main difficulties of the situation. The world was faced with a new condition of affairs, events happened with an unwonted celerity. There was neither tradition nor experience to appeal to for guidance. What was done was done blindly; there was a series of leaps in the dark. Had dangers been avoided and the ship of industry steered safely through that new and dangerous sea, it would have appeared as though the navigators were inspired with more than human skill. As we know, the quicksands and dangers were not avoided, and the country was awakened to find that material wealth was indeed accumulating to an unheard-of amount, but when those who cared for the moral and physical well-being of our rapidly increasing population began to investigate into social conditions, they were dismayed at the results on the human aspect of this revolution which was making England the envy of all the world. For it became increasingly evident that, side by side with great stores of material wealth and industrial prosperity, there was developing a hideous condition of affairs adversely affecting the great majority of the operatives.

Seldom in human history has a people been face to face with a situation so extraordinarily complicated.

Wealth was increasing, and yet commerce and industry were functioning under great disadvantages. The first desire of the industrial leaders was to break the shackles which threatened to curtail their efforts. Both law and custom had been framed or had developed to regulate a simpler, or at any rate a very different, social condition.

This country had been mainly agricultural, with a few important but comparatively small manufactures. The population, outside London and a few large towns, was fairly evenly spread over the country. Now it was moving into new urban districts—the whole balance of society was disturbed. The capitalist employer was becoming a power in the land; he was taught to buy cheap and sell dear. This policy not only applied to raw materials and manufactured goods, but was unfortunately practised in the hiring of labour. There was no equality of bargaining power between the manufacturer and the individual workman. The law looked with disapproval on any attempt at combination, whether of employer or employed. But it was the latter who suffered most severely from this. Outside one or two important chartered corporations, such as the East India Company and the Bank of England, commerce

and industry had been carried on by individual traders and master-men operating on a comparatively small scale.

Politically, too, the position was complicated. The American Colonies had successfully asserted their independence, and France, in assisting America, had learnt the dangerous possibilities of resistance to autocratic rule. Europe experienced the effects of the French Revolution, and the last decade of the eighteenth century saw the whole Continent in the melting-pot, industry and commerce neglected, with militarism and war stalking rampant from the English Channel to Russia. For a quarter of a century our quarrels with France entailed costly military operations, and the early years of the new century found this country saddled with a debt of unheard-of dimensions.

Our economic policy was a survival of Tudor and Stuart days. The mercantile system, as it was called, had been a useful scaffolding, necessary for building up a modern world-State. It was evident to thoughtful people that the scaffolding had wellnigh done its work, but statesmen were loath to recommend that a commencement should be made to scrap this scaffolding. Navigation Laws, Corn Laws, Protection, and Labour legislation had been so successful that, to a conservative people like the British, a policy which entailed meddling with these safeguards was naturally viewed with something more than suspicion.

In the economic sphere, however, the work of Adam Smith was working its way, and as to the need for modifying law and custom, Jeremy Bentham played his part. Unfortunately, the section of Adam Smith's book which was most carefully studied and applied was that dealing with the production of wealth. What he had to say about distribution and consumption was almost disregarded. There was a period of "Production run Mad," and the horrors connected with factory conditions became intensified. It may quite relevantly be asked, Who was to blame for the horrible conditions which developed in some of our manufacturing towns? The usual answer to-day is that it was the rapacity of the employers, and from this there has grown up an attitude of mind which has had much to do with the acceptance by the workers of the Marxian doctrine of the inevitableness of class warfare.

If, however, one will but study the conditions in our factories during the early decades of the nineteenth century, a rather different picture is obtained. The desire to grow rich, or to live at ease, was not confined to the employers. There was hardly a section of the community that was not con-

taminated with the current materialism. It was an almost universally accepted maxim that nothing should be allowed to hinder the work of production. Here was an unlooked-for opportunity for gaining both national and individual wealth, and it was the obvious duty of all to take advantage of it. Cheapness became a god, and cheap labour was held to be a necessary part of cheap production. The fatal habit then formed of studying the wages book for the purpose of keeping wage-rates low became an obsession with many employers, and has had dire consequences not only affecting the relations between capital and labour, but in its full effects placing us at a disadvantage compared with other manufacturing countries. For one at least of our chief competitors has realized that not *low wages* but *low labour cost* should be the aim of the progressive business man. Low wages almost universally lead to high labour cost, since they carry in their train the possibility of "ca' canny," and that restriction of output which under modern conditions means a more than corresponding increase in the cost of production. But this is anticipating the story that has to be unfolded.

Just to touch upon the conditions in the factories and their causes, it may be stated that whilst employers used every means to obtain cheap labour, and for this purpose not only cut the rates as far as possible paid to men, but opened their mills to women, girls, and boys—including even children of the tenderest age, other sections of the community played into the employers' hands, either to save responsibility or to make life easier for themselves. Guardians of the Poor saw their opportunity to empty workhouses, more especially of the children, who were indentured on practically any terms so long as the Guardians might be relieved of their charge. And the working population also is not without blame, for early marriages became the rule. The object was to have large families in order that the children might earn at factory or mill the means to enable their parents to live at ease. Nemesis naturally resulted; the wages of the family tended to decrease until the whole sum earned weekly was barely sufficient to keep body and soul together. The employers were to blame? Yes, but let it not be forgotten that the blame was by no means solely theirs. All participated. All were contaminated by the new crude materialism, and in the end all suffered. The excuse—for there is an excuse even for these horrors—is that new conditions arose for which there was no precedent. No one had the necessary experience to foretell what would result.

At length a spark of light was kindled, and from that moment things began slowly but surely to mend. About a

century ago it began to be evident that all was not well with the country. Men began to realize the almost unnameable conditions existing in certain industrial areas. At first those who investigated felt that so bad was the condition of affairs that Labour would be unable to help itself. Salvation must come from above. The upper and middle classes must reach down the helping hand and lift Labour on to a higher level. This may be looked upon as the commencement of modern Socialism in this country.

Robert Owen, the successful manufacturer, became the apostle of Socialism, and was indirectly the founder of the co-operative movement. He preached and *practised* that the human agent should be even more carefully considered and treated than the new machinery which was so jealously safeguarded by its owners. Education, high real wages, a higher standard of living, better conditions all round for the worker, became his watchword; he found himself misrepresented and misunderstood. Being of a somewhat fiery disposition, he replied effectively but none too wisely. Church and State regarded him at first with suspicion, then with open dislike. Ultimately he became warped, it is true, but the great benefits he was an instrument in creating are even now only partially recognized.

The elder Peel—the father of our Factory Acts; the Christian Socialists—Maurice, Kingsley, Hughes, and their associates; Lord Shaftesbury and many another honoured name, all worked towards the same end.

Manual labour, however, although living under conditions in many cases difficult for the present generation to realize, was not unable to work for its own salvation. In spite of long working hours and the deadening conditions of daily life, there were men who determined to risk health and life in order to prevent the handing on of unspeakable horrors to future genera tions. Their efforts led to the Trade Union movement. Thus there is the exceedingly interesting picture of two sets of reformers working on different, but somewhat parallel lines, to bring about the much-needed improvement in industrial conditions.

It is perhaps unnecessary here to trace all the developments connected with these movements—their successes and failures are for the most part well known. The successes of the Trade Union movement have enormously outweighed any failures—the present position of Labour in this country is mainly due to its own initiative and powers of organization. That from time to time it should seem to get on to a wrong track is only to be expected. Solid, steady improvement in conditions of

work and rates of pay have rewarded the efforts of the real leaders of the working classes.

So far as the other movements are concerned, whilst, superficially considered, Christian Socialism failed, yet in reality it accomplished a very great deal. The most tangible result of the efforts of Maurice and his friends is the Working Men's College, which, after a history of over half a century, still flourishes, and carries on the traditions of its founders. A recent book on the subject blames the Oxford Movement for the failure of the Christian Socialists and the Church generally to influence the workers in more material matters:* "Thanks to it her interests were narrowed down to matters concerning her own constitution and ceremonials, and she ceased to reckon it her duty to care for the well-being of those outside her own borders; thanks to it social reform followed Marx and not Maurice, and the masses lost all confidence in institutional religion." Whether this be correct or not, Socialism has tended to follow Marx. Class war has become the slogan of the extremists, and incalculable harm has been done to the healthy development of social and industrial reform.

The combined effect, however, of all the efforts made to create a sane public opinion on industrial matters is best realized by comparing conditions in 1820 with those of 1920. The history of that century shows that an honest attempt was made, and has been fairly consistently followed, to put things right. The national conscience was awakened, and the determination formed not only to alleviate existing evils, but to prevent their continuance. A century in the history of a country is but a short space of time. It took more than six centuries to perfect our parliamentary institutions, and more than five to perfect our judicial system. It will need time to get nearer to perfection in things industrial.

A century and a half ago the great revolution in things pertaining to industry and commerce began with the invention of the steam-engine. Since then the pace of the transition has been continually increasing. Inventions and discoveries have brought all the world into closer touch. India is nearer to England to-day than were London and Liverpool a century ago. The happenings on the markets in New York or the prospects of the cotton and wheat crops throughout the world are known in London within a few moments of their occurrence. The possibility of eliminating unhealthy speculation, entailing over-production and its inevitable results, unemployment and uncertainty, is within our grasp—indeed, one of the marvels

* *Christian Socialism*, by C. E. Raven, p. 22.

of modern business is the lessening of the speculative element in genuine operations. The world is within measurable distance of a more perfect industrial and commercial system. Yet, just as a great social advance becomes possible, the efforts of extremists threaten to destroy the chance. We are asked to disregard the lessons of history at a moment when, not only is the situation ripe for the long-yearned-for evolution, but all the conditions warrant the greatest optimism as to the immediate future.

Consider what the present position is. Just prior to the war industrial unrest had increased to such a point that pessimists seemed justified in foretelling a struggle which might lead to civil war. The position was indeed gloomy, and undoubtedly influenced the leaders of our late enemies in decreeing the war. With the outbreak of hostilities the real soundness of British society became evident: "Armageddon created nothing, though it discovered and rediscovered much. For a time it fused all sorts and conditions of men into one class, and that the nation. It revealed how grand and staunch at heart are the mass of our fellow-countrymen when tried by the touchstone of a grave and simple issue that they can understand."* The first need of to-day is that all shall understand the present position and its possibilities, as they grasped the significance of Germany's action in 1914.

Our industrial system, with all its faults, has one very great merit. Like our Constitution, it is elastic and has proved its capacity for evolution. The history of recent decades shows how that evolution has worked and is still working. Yet at the very moment when all the old causes for suspicion and misunderstanding are being made plain, and the remedy can be applied which within a comparatively short time would launch us on a new era of national prosperity in the true sense of the word, we are called upon to scrap all our advantages and plunge into the unknown ocean of revolution. The choice before this country is evolution or revolution: to put the remaining touches to the work of the men who built up our great heritage, and enter upon an epoch which was to them a dream of the very distant future, or to join the "Reds," turn our backs on the past, and intensify class war, till, as in Russia, the whole fabric of society lies in ruins amidst which the greatest sufferers are those to whom the greatest promises were held out by ambitious adventurers.

Stated briefly, the present position is that the more important sections of our industrial force are organized in Trade Unions and Employers' Associations. Both these need further

* "Manifesto to Trade Unionists," see daily papers August 19, 1921.

perfecting, but the skeleton of the necessary organization was in being even before the war. During the war period measures had to be taken to minimize the possibility of industrial disputes. To this end the Government set up the Whitley system. Already the results have been arresting. With a wider application of this policy we should have each of our industries provided with permanent representative councils, prepared to consider and settle either misunderstandings which might develop into serious troubles, or possibilities connected with trade developments. There is nothing better calculated to allay suspicion and conduce to smooth working relations than personal contact between the parties or their representatives. Here, then, we have rather more than a beginning towards a better state of affairs.

The workers apparently fear that as a consequence of the new equipment of factories and new processes introduced to meet the enormous war demand for manufactured goods, there is the possibility of producing the year's normal demand in a few months. This, they fear, would mean over-production and increased unemployment. There is undoubtedly a haunting dread of this happening. But so long as there remain human wants unsatisfied, it is idle to talk of over-production. The new policy should place industries in the position of working for a known demand, and all the factors required to supply the various markets should be able to take common measures to ensure the absorption of what is produced. With a world impoverished by four years of war, followed by the years of uncertainty, the possible demand for all kinds of goods and services must be very great indeed. It is true that owing to uncertainty and suspicion the actual demand both at home and abroad is at present curtailed. If, however, the markets were assured of regular supplies of goods at satisfactory prices there would soon be a change. Nor can one think of a more certain method for producing this assurance than the confidence resulting from cordial co-operation between all those responsible for the making and marketing of the world's supplies.

It should be remembered that commerce and industry in the twentieth century are not the close preserves of a small group of favoured individuals. For any country to maintain a leading position it is necessary that there be harmonious and complete co-operation between all those whose efforts are required to carry on the work of production and distribution. It is not true to say that manual labour creates all wealth, nor is it, on the other hand, just that those who organize should exploit the operatives. There is a growing interdependence among all the factors. The organizer needs the operatives, and

the operative is ineffectual without the capable organizer; both fail to attain the best if they ignore the services of the scientist, the inventor, and the various classes of commercial skill. The great need of the moment is to recognize the services that each can supply, and to make an equitable distribution of the wealth created amongst all the necessary factors. This should not prove an impossible task. There is a great amount of information available which, rightly interpreted, would show the relative value of each kind of service rendered. All the factors, moreover, should have free access to the available information, in order that responsibility as well as gains may be fairly shared. If financial risks remain on any one section, that section will expect, and in the long run will get, exceptional gains.

To prevent the suspicion that any one section is being exploited the whole situation must be patent to all who claim a share. Not class welfare, but harmonious co-operation alone can lead to the objective which is, after all, the common aim —a healthy, prosperous, contented population living under conditions leading to what is best physically, intellectually, and morally.

The Whitley policy judiciously combined with our existing system should go a long way towards solving the great industrial problems now confronting this country.

A. W. Kirkaldy.

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND

The subject of communicating the faithful at the Eucharist in one kind only is raising considerable interest at the present time. Abstention from the Chalice is sometimes recommended by total abstainers, and more frequently of late by others on grounds of health. And there are certainly a number of persons who, for one reason or another, on their own authority refuse to receive the Sacrament in both kinds. It is, therefore, desirable that the practice should be considered.

I

A study of the *history* of the Eucharist shows that in the cases of the sick and of the absent and of infants, Communion in one kind was practised in the early Church. But it is also clear that reservation in both kinds was the custom at least in certain places. Infants were apparently communicated in

one kind during the liturgical use. But there is no indisputable evidence to show that communicants generally were authorized to receive only in one kind, should they so prefer, during the actual celebration of the Eucharist. That the universal practice of the Church, both East and West, was to administer the Sacrament to the congregation in both kinds, there cannot be the slightest doubt. It is well known that this was the practice in the Mother Church of Jerusalem. When certain unorthodox individuals refused the Chalice in Rome, St. Leo condemned them in such terms as made it impossible for the faithful laity to repeat the practice without incurring suspicion of being tainted with heretical ideas.

It may be safely said that the practice of the Church was to communicate the congregation in both kinds, and that this practice was the universal rule for more than a thousand years.

After the first thousand years, however, there came a change. Somewhere about the year 1100 the practice began in a number of places of communicating people only in the Consecrated Bread. Who began it, or where, we do not know. But it found very distinguished defenders and opponents.

Among those who deprecated communion in one kind was our own Archbishop Anselm, who died in 1109. He considered that there is a symbolical importance to the communicant in the separate reception of each species. He stated most clearly that in reception of the Blood whole Christ is received, and similarly in reception of the Body. Nevertheless, he insisted that the custom of separate reception arose in the Church from the action of Christ, Who made this distinction at the Institution, and should be followed.

Similarly Pope Paschal II. in 1110 laid down the principle that nothing other is to be done by us than that which the Lord Himself first did on our behalf; and that no human innovation is permissible on that which Christ enacted, except in the case of infants or of sick persons who are unable to receive the Consecrated Bread.

However, the withdrawal or refusal of the Chalice became extensive in the next 150 years. St. Thomas, who died in 1274, says that the practice of many Churches was to communicate the people in the Body of Christ only, not in the Blood; and he defends this practice, both on the ground that it does not detract from the integrity of the Sacrament, provided that the celebrant communicates in both kinds, and also because it prevents accidental irreverence.

The matter came before the Councils of Constance and Basle, which ruled that the laity, and the clergy when not celebrating, are not bound to communicate in both kinds, and

that the Church has power to direct the way in which those who are not consecrating the Eucharist should receive. This was ruled on the ground that under either species whole Christ is contained. It was further asserted that a praiseworthy custom introduced by the Fathers, and observed over a very lengthy period, and approved by illustrious teachers, ought to be regarded as a law, which it was not permissible for any man henceforward to condemn or change without the authority of the Church.

These argumentative declarations at Basle (1437) show plainly that the withdrawal of the Chalice was being sharply criticized and resisted. The people in Bohemia were allowed to receive the Chalice on condition that they did not deny that the grace of the Sacrament could be received in either kind.

Luther vacillated greatly on the subject. But in the *Babylonish Captivity* he wrote: "I am much astonished at their assertion that it is wholly unlawful, under pain of mortal sin, for presbyters to receive only one kind in the Mass; and this for no other reason than that . . . the two kinds form one full Sacrament, which ought not to be divided. Let them tell me, then, why it is lawful to divide it in the case of the laity, and why they alone shall not be granted the entire Sacrament."

In the Council of Trent opinion was greatly divided. But the voting is instructive. Out of 155 members, only 38 were definitely for refusing to concede the Chalice to the Bohemians; 14 cautiously evaded decision; all the rest—that is, 103—were, with various qualifications and restrictions, in favour of concession. At the same time the term "concomitance" now became officially authorized by the Roman Church.

II

From the history let us proceed to the *doctrine*. The practice of communicating in one kind clearly implies a principle. As has been already said, when the early Church gave the Sacrament in one kind only to the absent or the sick it must have been distinctly understood, both by the Church in giving and by the individual in receiving, that the gift imparted was not impaired thereby, but was in all its integrity the gift which Christ intended to be conveyed. This principle was implied, because the act could not have been justified without it. If the technical term "concomitance" was not authorized until the sixteenth century, the doctrine was involved in the practice ever since the second century.

Undoubtedly the principle that he who receives the Sacrament in one kind receives the essentials of the Sacrament

has often been expressed in singularly crude and materialistic phrases. Thus, when it was taught* that the Body is not without the Blood, for the Body is living, not dead, therefore the recipient of the Body must be at the same time the recipient of the Blood, since the two cannot be separated: such statements betray that the writer had not escaped from the grossly materialistic conception of Body prevalent in the medieval period.

But if we remember that the Body of which we speak is the glorified Body of Christ, and if we describe the Sacred Gift received in the Eucharist as "the spiritual principle and virtue"† of Christ's glorified humanity, and say that to communicate "means absorbing the spiritual forces of His humanity,"‡ then the inference that reception in either kind is reception of the Eucharistic essentials becomes perfectly clear and almost irresistible. For this statement lifts the whole subject to a higher level, transcending all grossly materialistic notions. It renders it out of the question to regard the Wafer as exclusively conveying Christ's Body, and the Chalice as exclusively conveying His Blood. The spiritual principle of Christ's glorified Manhood is equally received by the reception of the Elements in either kind.

But the question whether the faithful ought to be communicated generally in both kinds cannot be determined merely by the doctrine of concomitance. For behind this question lie the facts of the Institution. Why did Christ institute the Sacrament in both kinds? Why did He give it to all who were present in both kinds? The history of the Eucharist would have been greatly simplified if Christ had consecrated the Bread alone or had communicated the Apostles in the Bread alone. What was the reason for the introduction of both kinds?

The answer must be found in the *symbolism* of the Eucharist. The Bread represents the Body, the Wine represents the Blood. The separateness of the two represents the idea of death. And it is universally recognized that the use of both elements is essential to the integrity of the Sacrament. No one would presume to consecrate the Eucharist in the Bread alone. Both kinds are necessary to its symbolical completeness. It is indeed sometimes argued that both kinds are required for the symbolical completeness of the Godward offering, but not for the completeness of the manward administration of the sacred gift. But that distinction is artificial and unreal. For surely the symbolism is more necessary towards man than it can be towards God. If the separate presentation of both the Bread

* Bellarmine, t. iv., 260.

† *Cf.* Bishop Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 61.

‡ P. 67.

and the Wine to God symbolizes the dying of Christ, the administration of the Sacrament to the communicant in both kinds has also its purposed symbolical meaning. For the Chalice represents Christ's Blood; and the Blood denotes the life. "The blood is the life thereof." So that communion in the Chalice symbolizes with peculiar vividness the scriptural conception of the communication of life. And this appeal of the Eucharistic symbolism on the sacramental side, as well as on the sacrificial, is of great value to the communicant. Therefore the attempt to confine the symbolical value of the two kinds exclusively to the Godward aspect of the Eucharist is a purely arbitrary restriction. There is no ground whatever for saying that this was the intention of the Institution. Undoubtedly this limitation of the symbolism to the Godward aspect is a necessary result of the withdrawal of the Chalice from the people. But it is exactly the contrary to what is suggested in the action of Christ, since He not only presented both kinds before the Father, but deliberately administered the Sacrament in both kinds to all the communicants. If the doctrine of concomitance were rigorously pressed to its logical result it would be permissible to celebrate the Eucharist in one species only. It would be no more necessary for the celebrating priest to receive in both kinds than for any other believer to do so. But if you once admit that both kinds are necessary to the Eucharist, you admit the symbolical value of both kinds; and then to restrict the symbolical value to one aspect only is unjustifiable, because it is contrary to Christ's practice at the Institution.

III

There remains to be considered the teaching of the New Testament.

And first the teaching of St. Paul. It is necessary to have the whole passage in 1 Cor. xi. 26–28 before us in order to follow more readily the criticisms which have been made upon it. "For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the Bread or drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and the Blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the Bread and drink of the Cup" (R.V.).

The Authorized Version of verse 27 is: "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread *and* drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily," etc. The Revised Version has corrected "*and*" into "*or*."

A common Roman interpretation of this passage is: St. Paul

says, "Eat the Bread *or* drink the Cup"—not "*and* drink the Cup." This is disjunctive. It makes the use of *either* the Host *or* the Chalice permissible. For the Apostle expressly goes on to add that the unworthy recipient of the Host *or* of the Chalice "is guilty of the Body *and* the Blood of the Lord." That is to say, unworthy reception in one kind makes the recipient guilty of both the Body and the Blood. Therefore reception in one kind is sufficient.

But the question is not whether reception in one kind is sufficient. The question is whether that can be the intention of St. Paul. Is it seriously supposed that St. Paul here contemplated reception in one kind? That is precisely what the very drift of the passage forbids us to imagine. For not only did he begin by saying, "As often as ye eat this Bread *and* drink this Cup" (where the reception in each kind is definitely united); but he concludes by saying, "And so let him eat of the Bread *and* drink of the Cup" (where he expressly enjoins reception in both kinds). It is the double reception, both of the Host and of the Chalice, which St. Paul most certainly intends.

It happens, further, that St. Paul distinctly calls attention elsewhere to the reception of the Chalice, "Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the cup of devils."*

Both passages are clearly addressed to the general congregation, and indicate that reception of the Chalice was the custom of the Apostolic Church.

From the Apostle we turn to the Lord Himself. In the Institution of the Eucharist Christ said, "Drink ye all of it."†

Now it has been argued that our Lord's hearers on that occasion were exclusively His Apostles, and therefore that the command to receive the Chalice was only meant for them; consequently that clergy alone are intended to receive the Chalice and that they obey this command whenever they celebrate.

But if that is the case, what becomes of the words, "Take, eat, this is My Body"? Those words were addressed to the Apostles alone just as much as the other. On this theory of interpretation the laity would be excluded from the reception of the Eucharist in either kind. Does anyone think that this was our Lord's intention?

Christ was addressing the Twelve as representing the Church. What He directed applied to the entire community.

The injunction, "Drink ye all of it," must apply to the generality of communicants, whether priests or laity.

Well, says a Roman expositor,‡ if so, why don't you Protestants give the Chalice to infants and to persons excommunicate? And that exposition, than which it would be hard

* 1 Cor. x. 21. † St. Matt. xxvi. 27. ‡ Maldonatus.

to find one weaker or less convincing, is repeated by one of the ablest Roman Biblical students of the present day.

It only shows the difficulties to which men are reduced when the Chalice is withheld from the lay communicant. We are concerned with Christ's intention for the normal and ordinary administration of the Sacrament, not with the treatment of exceptional instances.

It is, of course, unquestionably a Catholic principle that the accuracy of an interpretation of Scripture must be tested by the practice of the Church. The corporate interpretation must overrule the interpretation by any individual or school of thought. But the practical interpretation of the Eucharistic Institution by the universal Church for the first thousand years and longer is overwhelmingly in favour of communicating the faithful at the celebration in both kinds. The later practice of the Western Church has changed. But the Eastern Church is not in sympathy with that alteration. The modern Greeks are not favourable to communion in one kind. The practice of intinction has been criticized by Roman writers on the ground that virtually nothing of the species of the Wine remains, so that in effect this is communion in one kind only. But the practice must be considered rather in the light of the intention of those who practise it; and that intention is obviously to impart both kinds, otherwise they would not go through the process of intinction at all.

Moreover, the privilege of communicating in both kinds has to be, or at any rate is, conceded by the Roman Church to the Uniat Greeks.

IV

It must, of course, be added that there are undoubtedly cases in which reception in one kind is permissible. It may even be a duty.

If there are cases of intemperance where the loss of self-control contracted is so complete that even the reception of the sacred Chalice itself becomes a source of danger: then certainly such individuals are bound, for their own salvation, to abstain, since they by their own sin have made what should have been for their health become to them an occasion of falling. But we dare not argue from abnormal cases the duty of withdrawing the Chalice from all the rest of mankind, to whom, let extremists say what they will, this danger does not really apply. It is impossible for any believer in Christ to argue that Christ set a snare in the path of His own priests, and compelled them to run the risks of gross intemperance. And if that is true of the clergy it applies to the laity also.

There is also the further case of certain forms of disease which make it most desirable for other people's sake that the afflicted person should not communicate in the Chalice at the service of the general congregation. I understand that in certain sanatoria the rule is reception in one kind. It would clearly be right that persons afflicted with contagious maladies should abstain from the reception of the Chalice in the general congregation, or should be communicated separately from the reserved sacrament at a different time. This, I think, will commend itself to everyone as a precaution required by common sense, to say nothing of Christian charity.

But these are exceptional cases. To withdraw the Chalice from the whole of the congregation on the ground of *preventing irreverence* is an entirely different thing.

In the administration of Sacraments our safety lies in saying what Christ said and doing what Christ did. Conformity to the words and deeds of the Institution is the Catholic test of the validity of a Sacrament. There may be ceremonial additions, but there must be no subtraction from Christ's acts. What other security have we but this ? What graver criticism on sacramental actions can there be than failure to comply with the directions of Christ or His Apostles ?

Withdrawing the Chalice to prevent irreverence raises extremely debatable propositions. To begin with, Christ ran the risk when He communicated the Twelve. He was not ignorant of the dangers which would occur down the thousand years which followed upon the Institution, during which years the Church would everywhere extend the Chalice to all who came. One word of His could have prevented the dangers of all those centuries. Yet clearly Christ took the risks of the Sacrament. They are part of the risks of the Incarnation.

Certainly if any portion of the contents of the Chalice is spilled the believer is pained and distressed. But is there no difference between accident and intention ? Does not irreverence consist in the intention ? And cannot Christ in the Sacrament protect Himself ? Is it the dishonour done to Christ, or the scandal done to the Christian, of which those who withdraw the Chalice are most afraid ? Was the Church in the first ten centuries less careful of the reverence due to Christ than it was after the Council of Trent ?

And, further, this question of expediency may be looked at another way.

Withdrawal of the Chalice must always make the Church which does so liable to the criticism that it has deviated from Christ's institution. That withdrawal has always been a powerful reason for refusing submission to the Church. It has

been a cause of the most bitter contention, which might have been prevented by adherence to what Christ did. It creates a serious obstacle in the way of reconciling separatists to the Church. Is this expedient? Can it be really in the interests of Christian charity?

V

The Anglican position is, on this matter at least, unmistakably definite. The Church of England enjoins with no uncertain voice administration in both kinds. No Anglican priest can have the right to refuse the Chalice to the people. It has been sometimes urged that, while the priest is bound to offer the Chalice, the communicant has the right to decline it. But there is no foundation for this distinction. The obligation of the priest to confer implies a corresponding obligation on the part of the laity to receive. There is not the slightest trace of any corporate intention of the English Church to leave reception of the Chalice as a thing indifferent or at the option of the individual. Such a theory cannot reasonably be elicited either from the Anglican liturgy or from the historic facts of the restoration of the Chalice to the people. It is obvious that the intention of the English Church was exactly the reverse.

How deeply the English people revere the Chalice would be hard to exaggerate. It has caught the imagination of our poets, even although their faith might be uncertain and vague. The Victorian poet thinks of the church as the place "where the kneeling hamlet drains the Chalice of the grapes of God." And when he wants an illustration of exceeding preciousness and value he calls it "dear as sacred Wine to dying lips." It was not over-reverent; but it was the strongest illustration he could give of what men value most.

It is not easy to believe that the English people, who have thus valued the restoration of the Chalice to them, will be induced to part with the privilege as a matter of mere indifference.

But however that may be, the corporate intention of the English Church is beyond dispute.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A CORRESPONDENT writes: "You may be glad to hear how THEOLOGY is useful in parish work. A lady wanted something fresh to take with her Bible-class of working girls, and suggested various possible subjects, leaving them the final choice. To her surprise they thought it best to begin at the beginning of the Bible and work through. So she began with Genesis i. The girls had received Scripture instruction in day and Sunday school, but had no inkling of knowledge as regards modern science. The lady based her lessons on Mr. James's article in the July and August numbers of THEOLOGY ("The Origin and Fall of Man"), and was even bold enough to read large parts of it with suitable explanations. The girls were fascinated and the treatment was not beyond their comprehension. The lessons were most successful, and one girl came straight from work, missing her evening meal, in order to be present."

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

BY REV. W. B. TREVELYAN, FORMERLY WARDEN OF LIDDON HOUSE

VI.—PROGRESS IN PRAYER

WE have seen already that the higher kinds of prayer should be within the reach of any of us. This will make us cautious about holding back and tying down those who are anxious to try less well-trodden paths.

The true mystic is not a man with different gifts from the rest of us, but one who has cultivated to the utmost of his power a faculty which, even if it has lain dormant, we all normally possess. There are none of us who may not hope, even in this world, if it be God's Will to grant it, for some foretaste of the promise: "His servants shall serve Him, and they shall see His face." We shall remember the words of the wise man: "In all ages entering into holy souls she (Wisdom) maketh them friends of God and prophets" (Wisd. vii. 27).

PRAYER AND EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

There is a second point to be remembered which is of scarcely less importance—namely, that deeper and richer kinds of prayer are not inconsistent with a normal life of external activities.

This point is fully drawn out by Primate Abbot Butler in his *Benedictine Monachism*. Amongst other authorities he quotes St. Gregory the Great, himself one of the great mystical theologians, as teaching that the most that is possible is the alternation of the two lives (*i.e.*, the active and the contemplative). St. Gregory says, for instance: "We can remain fixed in the active life, but in the contemplative we are by no means able to keep our minds on the stretch. . . . And as the very weakness of corruption cannot for long maintain itself in contemplation, coming back again to good works it feeds on the memory of the sweetness of God, and is nourished externally by good actions and internally by holy desires" (Homilies on Ezek. i. v. 12). "Indeed," says the Abbot, "the whole

conception of the contemplative life is one in which the active good works hold a considerable and even, in point of time, a prominent place." He shows also that the practice of the Benedictines to-day is fully in accord with this (see *Benedictine Monachism*, chapter viii.).

Such a life is what old mystical writers, such as Walter Hilton, call "the mixed life." It is the life which so many of us, clergy as well as laity, have to live, and it is full of encouragement to know that we need not, except by our own fault, be excluded from the deeper kinds of prayer because our life has chiefly to be spent in ordinary everyday employments. This is the lesson so fully drawn out by Dean Church in his sermon on the Example of Christ (*Paschal and Other Sermons*). He shows that no life has ever more fully contained both elements than that of Our Lord Himself—"The first and prominent feature of that Life was the combination in it, most intimate and never interrupted, of the work of time and human life with that which is beyond sight and time. . . . No recluse conveys so absolutely the idea of abstraction from the world as Our Lord in the thick of His activity."

For most of us, in all probability, the failure to reach the higher levels of prayer which would so greatly enrich and reinforce our outer life has been largely due to our lack of determination in guarding our times of quiet, or in retaining the spirit of peace in the midst of our ordinary activities. St. Gregory says that some good measure of tranquillity is the essential condition of contemplation. One recalls Mr. Keble's words :

> "There are in this loud stunning tide
> Of human care and crime,
> With whom the melodies abide
> Of the everlasting chime;
> Who carry music in their heart
> Through dusky lane and wrangling mart,
> Plying their daily task with busier feet,
> Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat."
>
> (*The Christian Year:* St. Matthew's Day.)

The truest mystic known to the present writer is a layman, who has spent many years in a responsible post under Government, in the most unromantic and matter-of-fact occupations.

Prayer to be Brief

In aiming at such a spirit of recollection we must remember that prayer is far more likely to be real, and to spread itself over our lives, if we keep our actual times of prayer short. No one urges more strongly than Cassian that brief prayers are the best; and there are few greater authorities on prayer than Cassian.

Conditions of Progress

Why then, it will be asked, do so few of us get beyond the ordinary routine of vocal prayer and of discursive meditation? There must be many reasons, but one of the most obvious is this lack of determination in securing quiet spaces.

> "We nod and glance, and hurry by,
> And never once possess our souls
> Before we die."

Above all it must be remembered that any moral laxity is clearly an obstacle. It is the pure in heart who see God. It is those who will to do His Will who know of the doctrine (St. John vii. 17).

Obviously self-indulgence, or any permitted sin or laxity in the present, must incapacitate us. God grant it may not be the case that our serious failures in the past have rendered us incapable of the higher joys of prayer: perhaps to believe that would be a mistrust of the complete restoration effected by our Absolutions, especially if we are constantly praying, "Wash me throughly (*amplius*) from my wickedness and cleanse me from my sin."

A drawback of a different kind, which must be more fully dealt with in the next paper, cannot be quite passed over—namely, the fact that so often those who find great and even insuperable difficulties in ordinary meditation are not allowed by their spiritual guide to pass on to something less intellectual, and tending to give more scope to the affections and will. In many cases such a desire may be wrong and we may have to wait quietly, but there are many in which a great development of the spiritual life might follow if such a change were suggested or permitted. Some of us to whom it falls or has fallen to guide those who have had grievous difficulties in prayer must look back with some real regret upon what we now see to have been an exaggerated emphasis on the importance of formal meditation, a practice often too intellectual for our penitents.

B.—IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

VI

Let us consider this month a matter of great importance in the interpretation of the Old Testament, the twofold meaning of passages (*a*) as originally penned, (*b*) as accepted by editors and incorporated in a sacred book.

The problem meets us to a lesser extent in the New Testament, as we learn from Archdeacon Allen's Commentary on St. Matthew in the *International Critical Commentary*. Frequently when we seek his guidance on a difficult verse, we find him telling us the probable meaning of the words for the editor of the first Gospel, deduced from his treatment of St. Mark, but omitting to say what the words originally meant on the lips of Our Lord, or what they mean for us. This last is outside the province of a work of technical scholarship, and a discussion of the original meaning would not be the primary task of the commentator, who is dealing only with the version of the words found in a particular document.

In the Old Testament we are constantly confronted with the problem. Two examples may be given: the reader can think out others for himself. First, what is the meaning of Genesis in its present position, *as part one of a code of law?* The discussion about sources is familiar to all, and J, E, and P are generally accepted, though by some with a wry face. But we have no evidence that J, for example, was intended as a sacred book. In Genesis, however, it forms part of a great religious book, known as *The Law*. For us as Bible students, therefore, it is all-important to know the point of view of the editor or editors through whom it has reached us, no doubt with many excisions and modifications. It has been plausibly maintained that the background of Genesis, as we have it,

is the Babylonian exile. The early chapters contain implicit polemic against the Babylonian versions of the same stories which would naturally be familiar to the Jews. The exodus of Abraham from the land of the idolaters is an encouragement to those who are beset with the same perils. The whole history of the Patriarchs, wanderers on the face of the earth, has a special meaning for the exiles. For a people torn up by the roots and in imminent danger of apostasy, or for the same people restored to their land with the memories of the exile still vivid, Genesis prefixed to the laws is one long working out in the lives of ancient heroes of the first two Commandments.

Another example is the Psalms. Whether any can be ascribed to David is a question which can be set aside for the present. So strikingly have ancient traditions been vindicated of recent years that to deny absolutely the Davidic authorship of the Psalms is rash in the extreme. But a more pressing question is the place of the Psalms in Christian worship. Now recent criticism lays stress on the final editing of the Psalms for the purpose of Jewish synagogue worship. This editing is brought down to a very late date. The people responsible for it were the devout section known as "the saints," "the poor," "the humble"—the very people, in fact, whom we find so attractively portrayed in the first two chapters of St. Luke, and who in all probability passed over almost *en masse* into the Christian Church. There is really no dividing line between the Psalms and the Gospel canticles. Whatever the original meaning of the Psalms, when they were finally collected into a kind of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" for the Jewish synagogue, they were interpreted in a sense which shades off imperceptibly into the sense they bear in Christian worship. The upshot of this is that our modern use in no way does violence to the original meaning of the Psalms as they stand in our Old Testament.

Such theories are suggestive. They must not be accepted without most careful discussion and testing, but they serve to show how interesting the critical study of the Old Testament can be.

C.—PASTORAL WORK

By Rev. J. J. G. Stockley, Rector of Wolverhampton

VI.—THE TEACHING AND TRAINING OF CHILDREN

II

(2) *Day Schools.*

It is useless in this paper to discuss the future of Church Day Schools. Within a short time legislation vitally affecting the Schools may be framed; but, whether a new settlement aiming at a unification of the dual system will give the Church narrower or wider opportunities of giving religious training to the children whose parents desire it—this, at present, it is impossible to forecast. But it is surely out of the question to believe that the Church will relinquish the school buildings without having a definite and clearly expressed understanding that the children of the Church shall be taught the Faith of the Church.

As things are, the Church Schools are undoubtedly a great asset for holding a very large number of the children of this country to primary

religious beliefs—during their childhood. Indeed, it is fair to go farther than this. I have had experience of large towns, in some of which Church Schools are strong and in others a negligible factor of religious life. In the towns with Church Schools one cannot help noticing that the *general* level of respect for the Church and religion is distinctly higher than in the towns where Church Schools do not count. People who attend weddings, christenings, and funerals—and who, perhaps, seldom attend church at other times—know more about what is going on and behave better than in non-Church School towns. I do not undervalue the importance of this. Respect and a certain degree of reverence for holy things are not only good in themselves, but they are almost necessary conditions for firmer faith and life to be built on. And these conditions the Church Schools have supplied.

But have they done more? Have they supplied, in anything like reasonable numbers, Confirmation candidates and faithful, practising communicant members of the Church? Is there really any great difference, in the strength and devotion of Church life, between the parishes that have Church Schools and the parishes that have not? It ought, unfortunately, to be easy to answer these questions in what might be called the Church School side, but, with every wish to be fair, it must be allowed that it is far from easy. There are many instances of strong and devoted parishes where there are no schools. There are at least as many instances of weak and futile parishes where there are Church Schools —sometimes excellent ones.

And so it is fairly certain that, without taking too strong a line on one side or the other, Church Schools have not, on the whole, done for the Church's children what might have been expected of them. People will blame the clergy, or the school managers, or the teachers, as they know of particular cases in which any of these are to blame. Personally, I believe that the teachers have been least to blame. For in Schools where the teachers know that they are intended to train and teach the children as members of the Church (and where there is real interest in the work shown by clergy and other managers) the teachers will usually be earnest, patient, and successful. Indeed, I do not think the Church realizes what a great debt of gratitude is owing to some of the Day School teachers. They have done, and are doing, a number of things for which they are not paid. And they have, in many cases, shown to the children under their care the realities of Christian fellowship and loving guidance.

How far we clergy are to blame for the *comparative* failure of Church Schools is not for me to say. We are, at all events, agreed that we can, as a body of priests, do a great deal more with Church Schools than has been done in the past.

(*a*) We can, according to time and opportunities, help the teachers in various ways, by personal friendship, by co-operation in work, by instruction and hints as to the teaching of the Faith. The difficulty in many town parishes is shortness of staff. We need one priest whose main work would be with the Day Schools and Sunday Schools. And in some parishes of the great towns it is hard enough nowadays to have sufficient priests to preach, minister the Sacraments, and visit the members of the congregation. Only let us do what we can now, and decide to do much better when there is an adequate supply of clergy.

(*b*) We ought to teach in the Schools, regularly and systematically. It used to be true that there were clergy who spoke volubly for Church

Schools on political platforms but who, themselves, never taught in their own schools. Are there such clergy now? Very few, I believe, but there ought to be none. Of course there are good and earnest priests who sincerely say that the teachers, being professional, will teach the children much better than they can.

But surely this view cannot be justified. It is the business of us clergy to learn to teach children as well as adults, and we cannot throw off our responsibility. It is true that we cannot all be *equally* effective teachers, but we assuredly can teach the Catholic Faith in a sincere, simple, and effective fashion if we believe in it and live by it. No one ought to be unduly depressed or discouraged by seeing failure at first. If we persevere in the spirit of prayer and sacrifice, and if we show sympathy and love, we shall ultimately succeed. We can learn method and precision from the teachers as we watch them at their work in the ordinary school hours.

I would go much farther. Can there be anything more delightful in all our pastoral vocation than to interest the children of God in the noblest and highest truths they will ever know? Can there be anything more beautiful and touching than the face of a little child awakening to the sense of the reality of Christ's Presence and gracious promises of light and strength? Let us get the children to *feel* that the Church is their spiritual dwelling-place, where they can be at home, where their work is sanctified, where their fears are banished by the sense of Divine protection, and where worship is not only their manifest duty but their chief joy.

This indeed is an ideal, but not a fantastic one. Let us, when we value our Church Schools, keep it steadfastly before our eyes.

(3) *Sunday Schools.*

Church people are, it is to be hoped, gradually waking up to the importance of making the Sunday Schools something very different from the disorderly and haphazard institutions which have too long been tolerated. It is now recognized that, if Sunday Schools are to supplant or supplement home training and day-school teaching, they must be looked upon as an integral part of the life of a Church, and be organized and financed as such.

(*a*) Teachers must be selected (with reasonable care) from among the most earnest communicants of our congregations. If our young people in Confirmation classes are taught that "service" is as much part of their Christian duty as saying their prayers, they will be ready to come forward as teachers when they are called on. It goes without saying that a class for teachers, held weekly if possible, is a practical necessity.

(*b*) The equipment of our Sunday Schools—books, maps, pictures—must be on a much more generous scale than has been customary. The Parochial Church Councils should attend to this at once.

(*c*) Sunday Schools must above all be places where the children learn something of real prayer, and where they are constantly taught what the divinely ordained worship of God is. Children from our Sunday Schools can be influenced to love Sunday and churchgoing if they are wisely trained to assist at "the Lord's Service, in the Lord's House, on the Lord's Day." The greatest reverence must be insisted on, but every consideration should be shown to tender age and simple habits.

I have little space left to write of the system of the Catechism. My experience (as far as it goes) makes me believe that, where the full Dupanloup system cannot be carried out, modified forms of the Catechism to suit local exigencies and the English temperament may be tried with good results. It all requires time and thought and almost inexhaustible patience.

But it is well worth while to study this most fruitful method of the religious training of the young. In the near future we may be forced to use our churches (on weekdays as well as on Sundays) for the teaching of the Church's children. That this is not impossible I happen to know. In the meantime, on Sundays at least, let us, where circumstances are favourable, have the system of the Catechism carried out as thoroughly as we can. We shall build up the church life thereby on a solid and sure foundation.

The teaching and training of children! An awful responsibility! Under God we are making the world of the future. And for Him and for eternal life we are helping to prepare "the little ones for whom Christ died."

D.—CIVIC RELATIONS OF THE MINISTRY

By Miss A. Deane, O.B.E.

V.—THE RELIEF OF DISTRESS AND THE MUTUAL REGISTRATION OF ASSISTANCE

It was said by a great writer on this subject, "No person should take part in public charitable work without a general knowledge of the functions of the Poor Law," and it is indeed essential that we should understand the functions of the Poor Law and of charity. The Poor Law deals with the destitute, and it is sometimes very difficult to define destitution; but those who are without material resources directly available to satisfy physical needs—that is to say, those who have not the wherewithal to mantain life—are destitute. In order to obtain relief from the Poor Law destitution must be proved: charity, on the other hand, has no such test.

It must be remembered that the Poor Law draws its funds from the ratepayer; it is therefore restricted, it cannot remove or prevent distress—it can only relieve it. The administration of the Poor Law is vested in the Board of Guardians, an elected body, and they constitute the Local Authority in each Union. The election is by ballot and is in the hands of the parochial electors. There is no plural vote, no necessary qualification by rate, and there are no *ex-officio* guardians. Any resident of twelve months may stand for election.

For purposes of general administration to-day, each parish has a parish meeting or Parish Council. Each Rural or Urban Sanitary District has its District Council. As the rural parishes before elected Guardians who were also the Rural Sanitary Authority, so now they elect District Councillors who represent the parish as (*a*) District Councillors and (*b*) Guardians, but as Guardians they are an administrative body separate and distinct from the District Council. Everywhere excepting in Rural Districts there are Boards of Guardians.

When the Union includes part of a Rural and part of an Urban District, the rural parishes within it send their Councillors to the Board of Guardians and the urban parishes send their Guardians, but everywhere

the members of the Board are, like Rural and Urban District Councillors, elected by the parochial electors.

To be a parochial elector a person must have his or her name on the Local Government Register of Electors or the Parliamentary Register of Electors. These two registers together form the register of the parochial electors. The names on these registers make up a constituency of every rank and class.

It is the duty of the Board of Guardians to administer relief, either in the form of institutional relief or outdoor relief; under them are Workhouses, Infirmaries, and Schools, casual wards and casual relief, and outdoor relief and medical relief, including medical relief at Poor Law Dispensaries.

The person who is maintained wholly by the parish or borough is called officially a Pauper. The children who are looked after by the Guardians are nowadays as a rule boarded out. Relief may be given by the Guardians in the form of food, medicine, or other articles and in the form of temporary lodging.

The Guardians cannot grant relief outside their Union. There is a Clerk to the Guardians, and there are appointed Relieving Officers to administer the outdoor relief.

Destitution is the sole test in Poor Law Relief, and the districts should not be too large, so that Relieving Officers can make suitable investigations. There should in all cases be a large enough number of Relieving Officers to do the work carefully.

There is a great deal of work done in connection with cases of women who have been deserted, also with fallen women, the unmarried mothers. In connection also with the Guardians is the work of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

The Guardians are from time to time called upon to deal with exceptional distress, as has recently been the case, and it is disastrous if the policy is indefinite. In ordinary cases and in normal times it has been found essential to apply a certain number of tests. Thrifty and careful self-respecting men have sometimes to seek relief, and if they can be offered work it is, of course, best. It may be necessary in exceptional circumstances with large numbers out of work to institute public relief works, and to turn men of the kind stated on to it. There are men of all grades of respectability who may seek relief in times of abnormal distress, and these should be given work of some kind; but there are the idle loafing class who have been brought to their present need very often by vice and drink and utter laziness. These people should not receive quite the same treatment. They should go into the workhouse and should work in the ordinary labour yards and do the usual labour that workhouse men are required to do, on roads, etc.

It is often best that the man should go into the workhouse, and the wife and children should be supported in their home. If possible no homes should be broken up and outdoor relief should be adequate, but the man should be made to bear the burden of sacrifice. It is a vital principle of Poor Law Relief that outdoor relief should not be given to an able-bodied man. With public relief works there should be careful investigation of cases and only satisfactory cases admitted to the work.

The work should, if possible, be piece work at ordinary contract rates; there should be adequate supervision. The whole should be controlled by an *Emergency Relief Committee* consisting of representatives of the

Council, the Guardians, the Employment Exchanges, the Ministry of Health, principal employers and landowners, the ordinary household taxpayer, Trade Union representatives, and the heads of the chief charitable agencies at work in the town or district, and Ministers of Religion.

The Emergency Relief Committee should in no case undertake the ordinary work of the Guardians, but should definitely leave certain cases to them, only dealing with such cases as they are legally unable to touch. Much has been written about relief works. At best they are only palliative—they cannot and do not go to the root of the evil of unemployment; and it is abundantly evident to-day that something is very wrong with our economic system and that every possible channel for remedy must be reviewed, but this is not the place, neither is there space, in which to do it.

When considering the relief of distress we must remember there are other means of help than the Poor Law, and it has been the life-work of many devoted people to see to the right administration of charity.

There exist a vast number of endowed charities which are available to meet different needs in the community. These funds, which are in the hands of trustees, come under the supervision of the Charity Commissioners, who have been able to remodel the whole scheme of endowed charities.

The Charity Commissioners possess the power of inquiry into the conditions and administration of the bulk of charitable endowments. They have inspectors and they register annual accounts of the income and expenditure of trustees. It is important for those who are interested in the working of endowments to remember that they can inquire of the Charity Commissioners for help and advice and if they think at any time there is any need they can get a free inspection.

The Commissioners have established Official Trustees; they have very simple machinery by which the safety of charity property is secured and the expense of its devolution from one lot of trustees to another is saved, while the administration of the income by its managers is not interfered with. This is a great advantage to charity properties. The Commissioners also now exercise the old jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery in making new schemes to meet present needs out of old schemes.

To illustrate what is possible, in a certain parish money had been left to give gifts of meat, grocery, and clothes to a number of old people every month. It was found better to convert this endowment into a limited number of annuities, doing far more good, and preventing the influx into the parish of " gift-hunters " who came undoubtedly in many cases for what they could get.

There is not space to deal more widely at the moment with the whole question of charity, for at the present time it would seem urgently necessary to say something about *the Mutual Registration of Assistance.*

Owing to the abnormal conditions prevailing at the present time, the great amount of unemployment, and the various agencies that are at work on the relief of distress, it is urgently important that consideration should be paid to some scheme of central registration of the help that is being given to individuals.

Sad as it may seem it is undoubtedly true that at times like this there are certain people who manage to get help from the Guardians, the Employment Exchanges, the Churches, and from charitable persons, and instances are of daily occurrence when it is discovered that certain

people have something coming into their homes from all these different sources, whilst others, more deserving, are in much greater need.

In almost every town there is some definite arrangement between the Guardians and the Employment Exchanges so that the former may know, for instance, whether the latter is paying the applicants that come for relief Unemployment Insurance, but this does not cover the ground: every town should have its Central Register to bring about—

(*a*) Closer co-operation and association among the agencies of a district.

(*b*) Economy in time, effort, and expenses.

(*c*) Prevention of overlapping of relief and visiting.

(*d*) Detection of professional begging.

To all who have worked at charity organization these results are, in fact, "first principles."

The Guardians, societies, and charitable persons must co-operate. At a time when there is so little money to spare it is essential that efforts should be co-ordinated.

Registration must be confidential, and it should be worked in areas and districts. Where there are Guilds of Help and Civic Leagues administering charity for the town in which they exist they have in all probability a scheme of the kind in existence. If not, then the Emergency Relief Committee which has been called into existence to meet the present situation should undertake it. In the Debate in the House of Commons on the Unemployed Workers' Dependents Bill (which will extend the present scheme of Unemployment Insurance) it was stated by different members that something should be done at once to establish the registration of assistance everywhere to prevent overlapping and to ensure working relief on a sound economic basis.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED, 1921.

HALF-YEARLY: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester); *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels).

QUARTERLY: *The Journal of Theological Studies; The Church Quarterly Review; The International Review of Missions; The Interpreter; The Hibbert Journal; The Pilgrim; The Constructive Quarterly; Biblica* (Rome); *Gregorianum* (Rome); *Anglican Theological Review* (U.S.A.); *The Harvard Theological Review* (U.S.A.).

BI-MONTHLY: *The Journal of Religion* (U.S.A.).

MONTHLY: *The Churchman; The Expositor; The Modern Churchman; The Expository Times* (January to March); *Blackfriars; The American Church Monthly* (U.S.A.); *The Kingdom* (Canada); *Bilychnis* (Italy); *La Vie et les Arts Liturgiques* (Paris: April and May).

REVIEWS

GOD AND THE SUPERNATURAL: A CATHOLIC STATEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Edited by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. Pp. x + 346. Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1920. 15s. net.

THE six Roman Catholic graduates of Oxford who contribute to this book are well aware of the age in which they live: an age which does not know God, but which, tired of its long bout of materialism, is beginning to grope its way back to the supernatural, without knowing what to look for or where to find it. Such gropings are a welcome sign; but they are also a confession of spiritual bankruptcy. The " supernatural " of the mediums and theosophists is only a quack medicine, and it is important to define the Catholic use of such a keyword. It is here that the message of this book is clearest. For its authors the proper theological definition of " the supernatural " and its relation to the order of nature is the foundation upon which a statement of the Catholic Faith must be built. It may be safely said that there is no single point of Christian theology which is more grossly misunderstood by the average Englishman than the Catholic doctrine of the supernatural. Accordingly, in the second essay, Fr. Martindale gives a lucid summary of Catholic teaching on this point. It is also referred to frequently in later essays. We must make it clear that no Anglo-Catholic will concede to Fr. Martindale and his colleagues what they evidently wish their readers to conclude—namely, that this doctrine of the supernatural is held only in the Roman communion. It was, as they tell us, first clearly worked out as a consistent theory by the Schoolmen. But the Tridentine succession is not the only one which has inherited the mediæval tradition. If they will turn to the pages of Hooker, Bishop Sanderson, and Bishop Butler, to mention only leading instances, they will find a very full and solid continuation of the teaching about nature and supernature which we, as well as they, owe to St. Thomas. And if they will read Keble's Introduction to Hooker's works and the passages in Cardinal Newman's writings where he has left on record his debt to Butler, they will learn that this fundamental strand of Catholic thought was wholeheartedly grasped by the Oxford leaders of last century and woven afresh into the mind of the English Church. In view of these facts one is scarcely surprised to find oneself in warm agreement with perhaps nine-tenths of the positive theological statement contained in this book. It could hardly be otherwise, when we consider the immense

wealth of common tradition which we share with our Roman friends.

The most remarkable of these essays are, we think, those contributed by Mr. Christopher Dawson on "The Nature and Destiny of Man," and by Mr. E. J. Watkin on "The Problem of Evil." Both write with learning and with vision. The problem of evil is, for the Christian who thinks seriously, the toughest problem of all, and never more so than to-day. Mr. Watkin's treatment of it is quite admirable. He insists that all the facts must be faced, and he will have nothing to do with any clear-cut final solution. Yet he finds solid grounds for holding that "good is more natural, more powerful, more real, more widely extended, more deeply rooted than evil" (pp. 138-9). He leads us stage by stage just as far as it is possible to go—to that provisional conclusion which Christians must reach, if their faith is to retain its strength. "If we in our human ignorance can dimly perceive the supreme and unique value of freewill and victory, and the love which involves struggle and victory, we can surely believe that it was in infinite wisdom and love that God willed their existence even at the cost of all the evil . . . involved in their attainment." "The problem of evil remains, and must remain, unsolved. But in the Divine revelation given to us in Christ and His Church of the Divine purpose in the world we have at least an indication of the nature of that solution" (p. 162).

The main exposition of Catholic Supernaturalism, which has already been summarized in Essay II., is developed in more detail in Essays IV. to VIII., the central section of the book. Mr. Dawson begins with a survey of the materialistic view of man which has dominated the Western world since the fifteenth century. He traces through recent centuries the origins of "the modern doctrine of unlimited and inevitable material progress, a doctrine fundamentally unscientific and based on an irrational optimism, but which has nevertheless become a part of the ordinary mental furniture of the modern man" (p. 90). It is well to call things by their proper names; and in doing so to realize that this superstition, which receives its due from men of such widely different outlook as Mr. Dawson and the Dean of St. Paul's, throws a lurid light upon the quality of a civilization which has erected such an idol. The superstition exploded, materialism is left without chart or compass; unless, indeed, it compromises and acknowledges a higher life of the spirit, which is notwithstanding helpless before irresistible lower impulses. Mr. Dawson draws the conclusion, which not many years ago would have been received with a laugh of incredulity, that our present civilization is no more secure

from decay and ruin than any of the buried cultures of the past. The second half of this essay sets forth the Catholic solution of the problem of man; whilst a section in the following essay gives what may be called the Catholic interpretation of the problem for which a solution is so urgent. The problem is this: "If man is spiritual, why does he not live by the spirit?" (p. 94). To that there are two answers. First, he is hindered by his present state of original sin, wherein he is "fallen from grace"; but secondly, that grace which he rejected is offered to him again in Christ, so that by it he may be restored. As to original sin, Mr. Watkin remarks (p. 147) that its "very existence is ignored or contemptuously rejected by most modern men," although its "effects are but too obvious in history and experience." Yet the sheer weight of these "effects" are bringing it back into recognition. A writer in the *New Age* (R. de Maeztu) declared a few years ago that original sin must be one of the primary postulates of a sane sociology; and the American philosopher Royce, in some well-known lectures on Christianity written from an independent standpoint, fastened on this doctrine as one of the most illuminating features of St. Paul's teaching.

Fr. Martindale's theological style is difficult; but he has some things of interest to say about the Sacraments and the Last Things, although as to the former he has little room for more than a summary. Here the controversial note occurs only once, where we learn that "Anglicans use rites that are (save Baptism) no Sacraments" (p. 304). But speaking generally, these writers are eminently conciliatory to their fellow-Christians outside the Roman obedience.

L. S. THORNTON, C.R.

EARLY GREEK PHILOSOPHY. By John Burnet. Third edition. Pp. x+375. A. and C. Black, London, 1920.

It may safely be said that, though there are, of course, still questions about the history of Greek science before Plato on which a final verdict is beyond us, the present volume is by far the safest guide an educated reader can follow if he wishes to know how what has always remained in essence the "scientific view" of the world first grew up, and to whom mankind are indebted for the two or three great thoughts upon which it really rests. The only other book which can be said to be comparable in any way to Professor Burnet's—apart from Tannery's *Pour l'Histoire de la Science Hellène*, now over thirty years old—is the first volume of Gomperz's *Greek Thinkers*. But Professor Burnet, besides having the results of the last

fifteen years' work to draw upon, has the further advantage of being as judicious and restrained in conjecture as Gomperz is fascinatingly and uncritically imaginative. He does not allow himself to be seduced from the path of historical sobriety either by the temptation to draw fanciful parallels between ancient and modern thinkers or by the desire to paint vivid pictures which have no justification in our extant records. Anyone who remembers how Gomperz embroiders the simple statement that Xenophanes "used to recite his own compositions" and constructs a whole character-sketch of Anaxagoras out of the observation that his pure style was thought in the third century "simple and old-fashioned" will be able to appreciate the force of this observation.

I do not propose in the pages of THEOLOGY to enter on the detailed discussion of matters as to which there may still be room for controversy. It will be more profitable to call attention to one or two important points in which Professor Burnet's revision of his book makes the inaccuracy of certain still popular generalizations about Greek science even more patent than it was before. For example, one point which is made prominent, but not more prominent than it needs to be made, is the utterly secular character of the Ionian culture out of which science developed. How irreligious that culture was is often disguised from us by the way in which the early men of science speak of their primary body or bodies as "god" or "gods." Professor Burnet is right in carefully calling attention to the point that this implies no attitude of worship; it simply means that the "world-stuff," whatever it is, is indestructible. A Greek physicist no more worshipped "air" or "water" than a modern physicist worships "mass" or "energy." It ought not to be forgotten, though it often is forgotten, that the notion, which became popular in later times, that the "heavens" are made of nobler stuff than the earth and its contents, finds no place in really early Greek science. The distinction, as Professor Burnet says, was traditional in mythology, but it never appears in science until it was, with unfortunate results, intruded on physics by Aristotle. Before Aristotle every "philosopher" always assumed that the "heavens" were made of the same stuff as everything else, and Aristotle's reversion to the prescientific antithesis did more than anything else to arrest the progress of physical science for some two thousand years. In fact, the mischief was not confined to the domain of natural science. Perhaps it would not be much of an exaggeration to say that wherever in the divinity of the great scholastic age we come on dogma which absolutely resists assimilation by our own thought, examination will reveal that

the root of the trouble is this divinization of the material "heavens." Hence it is of the first importance to understand that the doctrine is wholly alien to the whole spirit of Hellenic science, and owes its supremacy over so many intellects, from the Hellenistic age to the century of Galileo and Descartes, to the influence of a single mind masterful enough to enslave its successors to its very "crotchets."

There is another widespread error which ought also to be dispelled by the study of a work like Professor Burnet's. Everyone knows the picturesque contrast drawn by the late William James between the "Greek" prejudice in favour of a "tidy and orderly" universe with the earth in its centre and the modern physicist's belief in an "untidy" "disorderly" universe with a possibly infinite extension. The contrast has been more forcibly expressed by James than by anyone else, but the belief that it exists was by no means peculiar to him. Yet the belief is pure and simple illusion. Greek science started, not with one tiny and orderly "world," but with a "boundless," with neither circumference nor centre, in which there are an infinity of perishable "worlds," much like the eddies in a running current. And this belief in the "infinity" of "worlds" remained the common assumption of physical science right down to the time of Plato, a point upon which Professor Burnet has always properly laid great stress. Among the pre-Platonic men of science, if we set aside, as we ought, the Eleatics, who regarded the sensible as a mere illusion, the only thinker who cannot be shown, either with certainty or with the highest plausibility, to have believed in "innumerable worlds" is Heraclitus of Ephesus. It is probably safe to say that the single finite spherical "world" would never have made its footing good in later thought but for the fact that Plato, perhaps unfortunately, committed himself to it in his *Timaeus*. Aristotle, who was half an Ionian in his thought, might have been expected to revert to the old Ionian tradition, but it would have been inconsistent with his deification of the "heaven of the stars," and, as Professor Burnet has said elsewhere, Aristotle, with all his Ionian prejudices, was "carried off his feet" by the genius of Plato. The Stoics again were committed to the one "world," partly by their dependence on Aristotle and partly by their selection of Heraclitus as their chosen authority among the ancients, though they did so far revert to the older views as to make their "world" periodically perishable in the flames of a universal "conflagration." To the Schoolmen, one "world" was more acceptable than many; Scripture seemed to speak only of one, and the voice of Greek science was represented only by the works of Aristotle and the translation of the *Timaeus* with a commentary by Chalcidius. It is a suggestive reflection

that if Plato had made his Pythagorean astronomer take the side of the "plurality of worlds," as the oldest Pythagoreans pretty certainly did, Bruno might not have been burned at Rome two thousand years later. A. E. TAYLOR.

BOOK NOTES

The Religion of the Scriptures. Papers from the Catholic Bible Congress held at Cambridge, July 16-19, 1921 (pp. viii+100. Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons).

These papers are too slight to be counted a serious contribution to Bible study. In fact, with the exception of "The Genesis of a Myth," a note on the supposed origin of Tobit, by Bishop Casartelli, they are distinctly dull. There are, however, one or two enlivening flashes from Mr. R. A. Knox.

Read in conjunction with the Papal Encyclical *St. Jerome and Holy Scripture*, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the real motive of the Congress was to rehabilitate the credit of the Roman Church, which (in common with other Continental currencies) depreciated considerably during the war, by presenting it to the world as the only trustworthy champion of belief in the Divine Inspiration of the Bible.

Christian Moral Principles, by Charles Gore, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (pp. vi+123. A. R. Mowbray, 1921).

This little book consists of a Lenten course of seven sermons preached in Grosvenor Chapel in 1921. The sermons were not originally intended for publication, nor were they even written down. We owe their preservation to the skill and diligence of a shorthand reporter. Their scope is sufficiently indicated by their titles—"The Way," "The Ten Commandments, their Original Sense," "The Ten Commandments for Christians," "Humility," "Charity," "The Use of Money," "The Right Self-Love."

They are marked by the clearness of thought and power of incisive expression to which readers of Bishop Gore's works have long been accustomed, and we venture to think them as good of their kind as anything can be. They are admirably adapted to make educated people think, and we hope that they are being widely read, particularly by those who have just left any one of the great public schools.

Social Prayer. Studies in the Lord's Prayer as the Prayer of Social Action and the Expression of Social Needs. By H. L. Hubbard, M.A., Assistant-priest of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Ashford, Kent. With an Introduction by Christopher Cheshire, M.A., Warden of Liddon House (pp. vii+95. Skeffington and Son, Ltd.).

The title of this book sufficiently indicates the scope of its contents. Mr. Hubbard has rendered a useful service in protesting against ultra-individualism in religion, though in view of St. Paul's charge to Timothy—"Take heed unto thyself"—we are not prepared to discard the appeal, "Come and be saved," as unreservedly as Mr. Hubbard would have us do.

Mr. Hubbard asserts, "It is the system which is to blame," by which he appears to mean the fact that commerce is a matter of competition. He tells us that "in the days long past commerce was regarded as a form of social service" (p. 50). We could wish that he had given more details

as to these days, and had marshalled some of his evidence for supposing that they ever existed.

His description of factory life (pp. 48-9) suggests the impressions of a casual visitor rather than the knowledge of an habitué. We think that if Mr. Hubbard were to spend some years in a larger industrial centre than Ashford he would perceive that the victims of " the system " appear to possess sufficient spare money to crowd out picture houses and football grounds *every week* coupled with abundant *joie de vivre* when they are there. That is, at least, something to the good. We do not mean that our present economic arrangements are all that is desirable. But we think that a comparison between them and the conditions which prevailed either " in the days long past " or at the beginning of the last century shows that we have much for which to thank God and take courage.

We note with satisfaction that Mr. Hubbard recognizes that " social reform " is *ipso facto* futile unless its motive and goal be wholly and unreservedly Christian. It is still sometimes necessary to point out that the pig makes the sty quite as much as the sty the pig.

Religion and the Child. A Manual for Teachers and Parents, by G. M. MacDermott, M.A., Archdeacon of Norwich, and T. Herbert Bindley, D.D., Rector of Denton and Hon. Canon of Norwich. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Norwich (pp. vi+90. S.P.C.K., 1921. 3s.).

We consider this little book to be the best value for the money which we have seen for a very long time. The authors have compressed an extraordinary amount of information into a very small compass, and have done so with remarkable lucidity. They are always constructive: which is by no means easy when dealing with the Old Testament. And one particularly useful feature is the list of books dealing more fully with each particular subject with which each chapter closes. We would commend the book as strongly as we can to all who have anything to do with the religious education of young people, and earnestly hope that it will enjoy the circulation which it deserves.

The Last Supper. Its Significance in the Upper Room, by Robert H. Kennett, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, and Canon of Ely (pp. 49. Heffer and Sons, Cambridge, 1921. 2s.).

Professor Kennett holds that insufficient attention is paid to the actual Last Supper itself as an historical event. He objects to " taking refuge in the assertion that the Saviour's Institution is a " mystery," because he holds that to do so is " to represent the Holy Communion as altogether out of harmony with the whole work of Christ."

Beginning from this thesis he sets to work to explain (or explain away) the mystery in the light of Jewish ideas.

We dissent entirely from his premise, and therefore feel tolerably confident that we do not accept his conclusions. But it is not sufficiently clear to us exactly what they are for certainty on the point to be possible.

The Structure and Endowments of the Church of England. A Popular Guide by W. A. E. Austen, M.A., sometime Rector of Yarm. With a Foreword by the Master of Balliol (pp. 37. S.P.C.K., 1921. 1s.).

This admirable pamphlet gives a very lucid sketch of the pedigree of an ancient English parish and its endowments. It is extremely interesting and should do much to silence ill-informed criticism. Every lay member of the National Assembly (at least) should possess a copy.

The Diocesan Synod in the Church of England (pp. 32. S.P.C.K., 1921). This brochure is the report of a Committee appointed by the Bishop of

Oxford in 1920 to consider the questions—(1) How synodical action can be made effective, (2) What should be its scope.

The Committee was a strong one; and the chairman was Dr. Kidd, by whom the report is signed. Its gist is that it would be well for the Bishop to summon all his clergy from time to time for purposes of consultation, and that although the clergy alone are the constituent members of the synod (which thus differs from the diocesan conference) the Bishop should invite representatives of the laity to attend when matters which concern them are under discussion.

There are eight valuable appendices, three of which deal with the actual working of synods at the present day in South Africa, the West Indies, and New Zealand.

The report is a very important document, and ought to be carefully studied by all the clergy. In days when railways, motor-cars, and posts did not exist such gatherings were indispensable if the Bishop were to know anything of the mind of any of his clergy; and we can imagine that they are necessary now in the scattered dioceses overseas where communication is more difficult than in England.

But it is possible that modern conditions have gone far towards impairing their usefulness, as they have undoubtedly made episcopal visitations nearly, if not quite, an anachronism. This does not, however, mean that there is no place left for a diocesan synod in England. The question certainly deserves careful consideration, and can, perhaps, only be decided by experiment.

Dr. Lyman Abbott at the age of eighty-five publishes a book entitled *What Christianity means to me* (Macmillan, 9s.). The author is a veteran American Congregationalist minister. His book does not pretend to be more than the expression of a personal standpoint. So long as he tells us what the friendship of the Master has meant to him, we listen with reverence and thankfulness, but when he deals with the vexed problems of to-day we doubt the value of his guidance. Thus, the opinions of radical critics are appropriated to support the author's view that Jesus founded no Church and instituted no sacraments, but St. Peter is quoted as the author of the First Epistle attributed to him without any suspicion that its authenticity is quite untenable judged by similar tests. A statement that without Christ we should never have had the blessings of our present commercial system, post-office, or industrial liberty reads curiously. The publisher's (American) wrapper bears the alluring advertisement, "Give your pastor a new book; he reads all the year round."

Dr. Orchard's standpoint is too well known to our readers for his last book of sermons (*The Finality of Christ*, Allen and Unwin, 6s.) to need more than a brief mention. Here again he maintains the advantage of being a Free Churchman, who can carry out the restoration of Catholicism more speedily and effectively than the trammelled Anglo-Catholics. It is hard to imagine stronger and wiser utterances than these, with more direct appeal to our contemporary problems. Dr. Orchard's ministry is in the nature of things mainly personal and individual, so that an excellent portrait adds to our pleasure in possessing the book

The *Suggested Syllabus for Religious Instruction* for Manchester diocese (Macmillan, 1s. 6d.) is an off-print from an appendix contained in Mr. Grigg-Smith's *The Child's Knowledge of God*.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

INDEX OF VOLUME III

JULY—DECEMBER, 1921

PAGES

ARCHIBALD EAN CAMPBELL, Bishop of Glasgow 156
ASKWITH, E. H., Review of: Burton on Galatians 242
ATCHLEY, C., The Epiclesis 90
BAKER, A. E., The Idea of the Eucharist 310
Benson at Wellington 280
BUTLER, G., Review of: Law's Serious Call 120
Cambridge Conference Papers 264
Canon of the Liturgy 99
Catholic Authority, The 249
Catholic Philosophy of History 23
CHEVASSUT, F. G., On the Writing of Books on Moral Theology 328
Choirs and Choir Schools 135, 197
Communion in One Kind 342
Constituent Grounds of Religious Authority 126, 188
COOKE, G. A., Review of: Driver and Gray, Book of Job 174
DEANE, A. M., Civic Relations of the Ministry . . . 112, 167, 232, 293, 357
DOUGLAS, J. A., Reunion Report from Canada 116
Early Greek Philosophy, Review 363
Epiclesis, The 90
ESCOTT BLOSS, W., Choirs and Choir Schools 135, 197
Eucharist, Idea of the 310
Faith of a Quaker, The 237
FARMER, G., Origins of the Septuagint 212
FLETCHER, J. S., Review of: Pearce, Walter de Wenlok 179
Frances Arnold-Forster 284
Galatians, Commentary on 242
God and the Supernatural, Review 361
GORE, BISHOP, Reunion Report from Canada 114
HAINES, C. R., Benson at Wellington 280
HEPHER, C., Review of: Graham, Faith of a Quaker 237
History of Penance 47
HOUSEMAN, H. G. 31
HUDSON, C. E., Psycho-analysis and Confession 234
Industrial Ideals 334
JAMES, E. O., Origin and Fall of Man 16, 78
Job, Book of 174
KIRK, K. E., Review of: Watkins, History of Penance 47
KIRKALDY, PROF. A. W., Industrial Ideals 334
LANGFORD JAMES, R. L. Ll., The Unique 145
Law's Serious Call 120
LOWTHER CLARKE, In the Study 38, 107, 163, 228, 290
Review of: Von Harnack, Marcion 297
Lutheran Church, New Movement in the 322
LYTTELTON, E., Review of: Letters of R. M. Benson 306
Marcion, Review 297

PAGES
McNabb, V., Some Main Divisions of St. John's Gospel 170
Miscellanea 36, 105, 160, 225, 287, 351
Montreal, Bishop of, Reunion Report from Canada 43
Moral Theology, Books on 57
On the Writing of Books on 328
Mr. Wells's Expanding Bible 150
Notices of Books 57, 122, 180, 245, 303, 366
Origin and Fall of Man, The 16, 78
Oremus 36, 105, 160, 225, 288
Papers for the Priesthood—
Civic Relations 112, 167, 232, 293, 357
Devotion 36, 106, 161, 225, 288, 351
In the Study 38, 107, 163, 228, 290, 353
Pastoral Work 40, 109, 164, 229, 291, 354
Parable of the Tares, The 31
Patterson, L., New Movement in the Lutheran Church 322
Provinces in the Church 206
Psycho-analysis and Confession 234
Psychology, Books on 56
Relton, H. E., Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy 5, 65
The Cambridge Conference Papers and Doctrine of the Enhypostasia . . 264
Reunion Report from Canada 43, 114
Report from Australia 287
Scottish Opinion 287
Riley, A., Review of: Ephimenko, Short History of Russia 118
Roseveare, R. P., Church's Message and Ministry to the Sick 218
Russia, Short History of 118
St. John's Gospel 170
St. Paul, Books on 245
Scott Holland, Henry 275
Selwyn, E. G., The Catholic Authority 249
Septuagint, Origins of 212
Sick, The Church's Message and Ministry to the 218
Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy. 5, 65
Some Principles of Moral Theology 50
Somervell, D. C., Catholic Philosophy of History 23
Mr. Wells's Expanding Bible 150
Sparrow Simpson, W. J., Communion in One Kind 342
Spens, J. A., Archibald Ean Campbell 156
Spens, W., Review of: The Holy Catholic Church 305
Stockley, J. J. G., Pastoral Work 40, 109, 164, 229, 291, 354
Taylor, Prof. A. E., Review of: Early Greek Philosophy 363
Thornton, L. S., Review of: Kirk, Some Principles of Moral Theology . . 50
Review of: God and the Supernatural 361
Thouless, R. H., Constituent Grounds of Religious Authority . . . 126, 188
Trenholme, E. C., Canon of the Liturgy 99
Trevelyan, W. B., Devotion 36, 106, 161, 225, 288, 351
Unique, The 145
Vaughan, J., Review of: Relics or Realities ? 307
Walter de Wenlock 177
Watkins, Review of: The Moral Theology of the Sacrament of Penance . . 304
Watson, E. W., Provinces in the Church 206
Winchester, Bishop of, Henry Scott Holland 275